1644
B 36

THE DIOCESANS TRYALL,

WHEREIN

The maine Controverſies about the **Forme or Governement of the Churches of Chriſt** are judiciouſly ſtated, and learnedly diſcuſſed in the opening and thorough debating of theſe three Queſtions following,

viz.

1. *Whether Chriſt did inſtitute, or the Apoſtles frame any Dioceſan forme of Churches, or whether Pariſhionall only?*
2. *Whether Chriſt ordained by himſelfe or by his Apoſtles any ordinary Paſtours, having both precedencie of order and majority of power over others?*
3. *Whether Chriſt did Immediately commit ordinary power Eccleſiaſticall, and the exerciſe of it, to any one ſingular perſon, or to an united multitude of Preſbyters?*

A worke ſeaſonable and uſefull for theſe times, being very helpefull to the deciding of the differences now in queſtion upon this ſubject.

Written long ſince by that Famous and learned Divine,
Mr PAUL BAYNE.

And now Publiſhed by Authority.

LONDON,
Printed for *John Bellamie*, and are to be ſould at his Shop at the Signe of the three Golden-Lyons in Cornehill neare the Royall-Exchange, M. DC. XL IV.

LIBRARY OF UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK.
GIFT FROM
DAVID H. McALPIN.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

NOV 24 1944

THE PREFACE.

MAny writings, and ſermons alſo have cauſe to wiſh that the men from whom they come were leſſe knowen then they are. For then ſhould they be free from much prejudice, and find better acceptance with thoſe that they come to. But I wiſh nothing more unto this Treatiſe, which is now cõming into the world, then that the Author of it were throughly known unto all thoſe that ſhall meet with it; for then his work would need no borrowed commendation, the title it ſelf carrying authority with it, even to force reſpect from every honeſt Reader, if either the ſharpnes of wit, variety of reading, depth of judgment, aptnes to teach, holy and pleaſant language, heavenly converſation, wiſe cariage, or any fulnes of grace wil ſo far prevail with him. I doe not abuſe good words, or load one with thhem whom they do not belong to, as many painters of Sepulchrs in their funerall Orations uſe to do: but ſpeak that in ſhort, which M. Baines his perſon did largly preach unto all ſuch as came neer unto him: & that which his incomparable writings wil ſufficiently witnes to futur generations.

Neither is this all that the Authours quality may ſuggeſt unto the conſiderate Reader: but he may ariſe from this to more important thoughts; eſpecially if the remembrance of M. Baines his worth do occaſion him to think of many others like unto him: ſuch as M. Deering, M. More M. Greenham, M. Perkins, M. Rogers, M. Cartwright, M. Fenner, M. Brightman, M. Parker, M. Philips, M. Hieron, and M. Bradſhaw, &c. to ſpeak nothing of thoſe which yet live, nor of D. Reinolds, D. Fulk, and D. Whitakers with many others. For all theſe being apprehẽded as mẽ agreeing in one ſpirit, & having had indeed the ſpirit of glory reſting on them, as their works do ſhew, together with thoſe letters teſtimonial which they left written in the hearts of many thouſand Chriſtians, it muſt needs cauſe at the leaſt an inquiry, what

the reaſon ſhould be what ſuch famous men of God, could never like wel of our Biſhoply courſes in England, nor ever be favoured of them. The caſe is plaine to all: and the cauſe is as evident to thoſe that have eyes to ſee: but no where more apparant then in the perſon of M. Baines, and the place where he, and others like him were made ſignes of this antipathie. Cambridge is or ſhould be, as an eye to all our land: ſo that the alterations that fall out there cannot but be felt of all parts. It is the place of light; the ſpirituall oppreſſions which in other corners are covered with darkneſſe (as all the works of darkneſſe would be) when paſt all ſhame they come to confront the Sunne it ſelfe, how can they then be hidden?

When M. Perkins had there for many yeares held forth a burning and ſhining light, the ſparks wherof did flie abroad into all corners of the land, and after he had ſerved his time was taken up into heaven, there was none found ſo meet for to receive, as it were, the torch out of his hand, and ſucceed him in that great office of bearing it before ſuch a people, as this M. Bains, upon whom alſo the ſpirit of that Elias, was by experience found to be doubled. In this ſtation he ſo demeaned himſelf for ſome years, that impietie only had cauſe to complaine: for all that favoured the waies of God, rejoyced and gloried in him and his Miniſtery, as a ſpirituall treaſure. But at length the hower of darknes came from Lambeth, when Arch. Bancroft ſent M. Harſenet to Viſite as they call it, that is (if termes may be interpreted by common practiſe) to pick the purſes of poore men, and to ſuppreſſe thoſe that are not friends to the Biſhops Kingdome. For though in that circuit there were a multitude of unable and notoriouſly ſcandalous Miniſters, yet none were foūd worthy of cenſure, but only M. Baines, of whom the world was not worthy, and one other Preacher like unto him. Now it is hard to ſay, whether the ſilencing of him was more odious, or the manner of it ſhameles. There muſt be a Sermon (ye know) at ſuch Viſitations, for faſhion ſake, though the Viſiter himſelf can ſeldom find leaſure to make it. This part was therfore appointed to M. Bains by

the

the Viſiters that he might either be inſnared in his words, if he did not apply himſelf to their humours, or elſe grace their ungratious courſes, if he did. But it did not ſucceed handſomly either way: For he delivered wholeſome doctrine appertaining to the preſent audience, in ſuch warie manner, that no ſpecious occaſion could be taken therby of queſtioning his liberty. Yet fairely or fouly the miſchievous intention muſt not faile. M. Baines having heat his weak body by ſtraining to ſpeak unto a great audience, retired himſelfe preſently upon his comming down from the Pulpit to provide for his health, which otherwiſe would have bin indangered. They in the meã time going on with their buſineſſe, as they are wont in the maſterly forme of a muſter, called for M. Baines amongſt the reſt, and upon his not anſwering, though he was not cited thither as to a Court, but only intreated to preach, as he did, yet for not appearing, he was immediately ſilenced. Afterward in deed, the Chancellor being informed of that groſſe nullity, which was in the ſentence, urged him about ſubſcription and conformity; and ſo to make ſure work, ſilenced him over again: In which buſineſſe he was ſo conſcious unto himſelf of unreaſonable and ridiculous dealing, that when M. Baines ſtanding to receive the ſentence of a corrupt man, did lift up his heart and eies unto God with a heavenly ſmiling countenance, as he uſed, he interpreted that geſture to be a skorne of his authority. This being don, M. Baines was perſwaded by his friends to try the Archbiſhops courteſie, unto whom, when he preſented himſelf, at the very firſt ſalutation; the gravity and ſeverity of B. Bancroft led him ſharply to rebuke the good man for a little black-worke, which was upon the edges of his cuffes, asking him how he durſt come before him with ſuch cuffs, telling him very biſhoplike, that it were a good turn to lay him by the heels for ſo doing. After this he would have no more to do with ſuch abſurd unreaſonable men: but preached ſomtime wher he might have liberty, as his weakeneſſe of body would ſuffer; and ſpent the reſt of his time in reading, meditating, praying and writing, ſaving that upon occaſion hee did

inſtruct or comfort thoſe which came to him in private; wherin he had a heavenly gift. He was indeed all his life after, beſide the weakenes of his body preſſed with want, no having (as he often complained to his friends) a place to reſt his head in: which me thought was an upbraiding of the age and place where he lived with baſe regardleſnes of piety & learning: yet he never ſo much as conſulted with himſelfe of denying his ſinceritie by pleaſing the Biſhops, of whom and their courſes he was wont to ſay, *They are a generation of the earth, earthly, and ſavour not the waies of God.* Which ſaying of his, they, and ſome Doctors of Cambridge have ſince made good, in that they could not indure, that the place from whence they thruſt him, ſhould be ſupplied by other honeſt men, though they were cõformable, but with abſolute authority at length forbad it, alledging that Puritanes were made by that lecture: wheras the truth is, that one lecture hath done more good to the Church of God in England, then all the doctors of Cambridge: though I doe not deny, but ſome of them have wrought a good work.

By this one inſtance (of which kind I would there were not a 100 in our land) it may eaſily appeare to the underſtanding Reader, that here is as much agreement betwixt our Biſhops in their managing of Religion (except ſome 2 or 3, which went out of their elements, when they ventered on thoſe places) & thoſe powerful Preachers who have bin the chief means of revealing Gods arme unto ſalvation, as there is betwixt the light which commeth down from heaven, & that thick miſt which ariſeth from the loweſt pit.

But wee need not ſeeke for demonſtrations of the ſpirit which worketh in our Hierarchie from this oppoſition, look but at the fruits of it, wher it hath all fulnes of conſent, as Cathedrall Pallaces, or Pariſhes of Biſhops and Archbiſhops reſidence, ſuch as Lambeth is, where all their canons are in force, and have their full ſway without contradiction: nay come neerer unto them, and take a view of their families, even to them that wait in their chambers, and ſee what godlineſſe there is to be found. Have there not more of God and his Kingdome appeared in ſome one Congregation

gation of thoſe Miniſters which they have ſilenced for unconformity then in all the Biſhops families that are now in England? Was there ever any of them that could endure ſuch a Pariſh as Lambeth is, if they had ſuch power of reforming it as the Archbiſhops haue?

To returne therfore unto our Authour: whilſt he lived a private life, being thus ſtrucken with the Biſhops Planet, he had time to apply his able wit and judgement unto the diſcuſſing of many queſtions, which if the Prelates had not forced ſuch leaſure upon him, it may be he would have paſſed by with others. And among the reſt, by Gods providence he was directed to theſe Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies which concerne our Dioceſan ſtate in England: wherin, as in all other queſtions which he dealt in, he hath ſhewed ſuch diſtinct and piercing underſtanding together with evidence of truth, as cannot but give good ſatisfaction to him that in theſe things ſeeketh light.

He might indeed have choſen other particular corruptions to have written on, if it had bene his purpoſe either to have taught men, what they daily ſee and feel, or to have laboured about the branches, and leave the root untouched: But it was no delight unto him, for to prove that which no man doubted of, as that the common courſe and practiſe of our Prelates, their courts, their urging of ſubſcripions, with human ſuperſtitious ceremonies, are preſumptuous inſolencies againſt God and his Church: or prepoſterouſly to begionne at the end of the ſtreame for to cleanſe the water. He choſe rather to ſearch the fountain of all that foulnes wherwith our Churches are ſoiled: which he judged to be found in the conſtitutions here in this Treatiſe examined. And if theſe few queſtions be wel conſidered, it will appear that a multitude of pernitious abuſes doe depend on thoſe poſitions which in them are confuted. One fundamentall abuſe in our Eccleſiaſticall oppreſſion in the diſpoſing of charges, our placing of Miniſters over Congregations: It is called uſually beſtowing of Bēefices or Livings, in an earthy phraſe which ſavoureth of the baſe corruption commonly practiſed. For Congregations ought not to be beſtowed on Miniſters,

niſters, but Miniſters on Congregations: the benefit or benefice of the Miniſter, is not ſo much to be regarded, as of the Congregation: It is the calling and charge which every Miniſter ſhould looke at, not his living and benefice. Now theſe Benefices are beſtowed ordinarily by the Patrō (whether Popiſh, prophane, or religious, all is one) & the Biſhop, without any regard of the peoples call or conſent: ſo as no lawful mariage is made; no ſervant placed: againſt all Scripture, Councels and antient examples. Wherby it commeth ordinarily to paſſe, that Lawyers muſt determine of Miniſters callings, after long ſutes and great charges; as if Congregations and Farms were held by one title and right. And ſometime it is found that the Miniſter is a continuall plague unto his people, living in contention, ſpite & hatred with them, as many law-ſuits do too too plainly witnes. What is the reaſon? Becauſe Pariſhes are eſteemed as no Churches that ever were ordained by Chriſt, or received any power and priviledges from him, but as mans creatures, and by man to be ordered as it pleaſeth him. Another practice of like nature with the former, is that the miniſter being called to one Congregation, becommeth a Pluraliſt by taking another, or more livings, in ſpite of that Congregation, to which he was firſt and is ſtill perſonally tied. And after this he may be a nonreſident, abiding or Preaching at none of his many livings. Nay he may chop and change, ſell and buy like a marchant, ſo he do it cloſely; which is ſuch an abomination, as Rome and Trent condemneth, and hell it ſelfe will ſcarſe defend. What is the ground? Becauſe (forſooth) Chriſt hath not appointed Pariſhes, their officers & offices, and therfore no man is bound further in this kinde, then mens Laws, canons, cuſtomes, and injunctions do preſcribe unto them. For a grave Doctor of Cambridge anſwered one that queſtioned him for his groſſe non-reſidencie, *viz.* that Pariſhes were divided by a Pope: inſinuating as it ſeemeth, that he accounted it a point of Poperie, for to tie Miniſters unto their particular charges.

A third groſſe corruption is, that the officers in Congregations, Miniſters, Church-wardens, &c. are made ſervants to the

the Biſhops, Chancellours, Archdeacons, &c. being, as it were, their promotors, informers, and executioners, in all matters of jurisdiction and government, for to bring in mony into their purſes: for performance alſo of which ſervice to them, the Church-wardens upon every occaſion are enforced to take ſuch corporall oathes as not one of them doth ever keep. What other ground of this, beſide the fore-mentioned, that particular Congregations are no ſpirituall incorporations, and therefore muſt have no officers for government within themſelves?

Now all theſe confuſions with many others of the ſame kind, how they are condemned in the very foundation of them, M. Bains here ſheweth in the firſt queſtion by maintaining the divine conſtitution of a particular Church, in one Congregation. In which queſtion he maintaineth againſt his adverſaries a courſe not unlike to that which Armachanus, in the dai s of King Edward the third, contended for againſt the begging Friers in his booke called *The defence of Curates*: For when thoſe Friers incroached upon the priviledges of Parochiall Miniſters, he withſtood them upon theſe grounds: *Eccleſia Parochialis juxta verba Moſis Deut. 12. eſt locus electus a Deo, in quo debemus accipere cuncta quæ præcipit Dominus ex Sacramentis. Parochus eſt ordinarius Parochiani: eſt perſona a Deo præcepta, vel mandato Dei ad illud miniſterium explendum electa:* which if they be granted, our adverſaries cauſe may goe a begging with the foreſaid Friers.

Another ſort of corruptions there are, which though they depend upon the ſame ground with the former, yet immediately flow out of the Hierarchie. What is more diſſonant from the revealed will of Chriſt in the Goſpell, even alſo from the ſtate of the Primitive Church, then that the Church and Kingdome of Chriſt ſhould be managed as the Kingdomes of the world, by a Lordly authority, with externall pompe, commanding power, contentious courts of judgement, furniſhed with chancellors, officials, commiſſaries, advocates, proctors, paritors, and ſuch like humane devices? Yet all this doth neceſſarily follow up-

on the admitting of such Bishops as ours are in England: who not onely are Lords over the flock, but doe professe so much in the highest degree, when they tell us plainly, that their Lawes or Canons doe binde mens consciences. For herein we are like the people of Israel, who would not have God for their immediate King, but would have such Kings as other Nations: Even so the Papists, and we after them, refuse to have Christ an immediate King in the immediate government of the Church; but must have Lordly Rulers with state in Ecclesiasticall affaires, such as the world hath in civill.

What a miserable pickle are the most of our Ministers in, when they are urged to give an account of their calling? To a Papist indeed they can give a shifting answer, that they have ordination from Bishops, which Bishops were ordained by other Bishops, and they, or their ordainers by Popish Bishops: this in part may stop the mouth of a Papist: but let a Protestant which doubteth of these matters move the question, and what then will they say? If they flie to popish Bishops, as they are popish, then let them goe no longer masked under the name of Protestants. If they alledge succession by them from the Apostles, then (to say nothing of the appropriating of this succession unto the Popes chaire, in whose name, and by whose authority our English Bishops did all things in times past) then I say they must take a great time for the satisfying of a poore man concerning this question, and for the justifying of their station. For untill that out of good records they can shew a perpetuall succession from the Apostles unto their Diocesan which ordained them, and untill they can make the poore man which doubteth, perceive the truth and certainty of those records, (which I wish they will doe at leasure) they can never make that succession appeare. If they flye to the Kings authority, the King himself will forsake them, and deny that he taketh upon him to make or call Ministers. If to the present Bishops and Archbishops, alas they are as farre to seeke as themselves, and much further. The proper cause of all this

misery

miſery is the lifting up of a lordly Prelacy, upon the ruines of the Churches liberties.

How intollerable a bondage is it, that a Miniſter being called to a charge, may not preach to his people except he hath a licence from the Biſhop or Archbiſhop: Cannot receive the beſt of his Congregation to communion if he be cenſured in the ſpirituall Courts, though it be but for not paying of ſix pence which they required of him in any name, be the man otherwiſe never ſo innocent: nor keep one from the communion, that is not preſented in thoſe Courts, or being preſented is for money abſolved, though he be never ſo ſcandalous: and muſt often times (if hee will hold his place) againſt his conſcience put backe thoſe from communion with Chriſt, whom Chriſt doth call unto it (as good Chriſtians if they will not kneele) and receive thoſe that Chriſt putteth backe, at the command of a mortall man.

What a burthen are poore Miniſters preſſed with, in that many hundreds of them depend upon one Biſhop and his Officers: they muſt hurry up to the ſpirituall Court upon every occaſion, there to ſtand with cap in hand, not onely before a Biſhop, but before his Chancellour, to bee railed on many times at his pleaſure: to be cenſured, ſuſpended, deprived, for not obſerving ſome of thoſe canons which were of purpoſe framed for ſnares, when far more ancient and honeſt canons are every day broken by theſe Iudges themſelves for lucre ſake, as in the making of Vtopian Miniſters, who have no people to miniſter unto; in their holding of commendams, in their taking of money, even to extortion, for orders and inſtitutions: in their ſymony, as well by giving as by taking: and in all their idle, covetous, and ambitious pompe? For all theſe and ſuch like abuſes, we are beholding to the Lordlineſſe of our Hierarchy: which in the root of it, is here overthrown by M. Bayne, in the concluſions of the ſecond and third Queſtion. About which he hath the very ſame controverſie, that Marſilius Paravinus in part undertooke long ſince, about the time of Edward the ſecond, againſt the Pope.

For he in his booke called *Defensor pacis*, layeth the same grounds that here are maintained. Some of his words, though they be large, I will here set downe for the Readers information. *Potestas clavium sive solvendi & ligandi, est essentialis & inseparabilis Presbyterio in quantum Presbyter est. In hac authoritate, Episcopus à Sacerdote non differt, teste Hieronymo, imo verius Apostolo, cujus etiam est aperta sententia. Inquit enim Hieronymus super Mat. 16: Habent quidem eandem judiciariam potestatem alii Apostoli, habet omnes Ecclesia in Presbyteris & Episcopis: præponens in hoc Presbyteros, quoniam authoritas hæc debetur Presbytero, in quantum Presbyter, primo, & secundum quod ipsum &c.* Many things are there discoursed to the same purpose, dict. 2. c. 15. It were too long to recite all. Yet one thing is worthy to be observed how he interpreteth a phrase of Ierome so much alledged, and built upon by the Patrons of our Hierarchy. Ierome saith ad Evagr. that a Bishop doth nothing, excepting ordination, which a Presbyter may not doe. Of this testimony D. Downan avoucheth, that nothing can be more pregnant then it, to prove that Bishops were superiour to Presbyters in power of ordination. But heare what this ancient Writer saith, *Ordinatio non significat ibi potestatem conferendi, seu collationem sacrorum ordinum: sed oeconomicam potestatem regulandi vel dirigendi Ecclesiæ ritus, atque personas, quantum ad exercitium divinus cultus in templo; unde ab antiquis legumlatoribus vocantur Oeconomi reverendi.*

It would be over long to declare all the use which may be made of this Treatise, which being it selfe so short, forbiddeth prolixity in the Preface. If the Author had lived to have accomplished his purpose in perfecting of this worke, he would (it may be) have added such considerations as these: or at least he would have left all so clear, that any attentive Reader might easily have concluded them from his premisses. For supply of that defect, these practicall observations are noted: which with the dispute it selfe, I leave to be pondered by the conscionable Reader.

W. Ames.

The

THE FIRST QVESTION IS, WHETHER CHRIST DID INSTITUTE OR THE APOSTLES frame any Dioceſan forme of Churches, or Pariſhionall onely.

FOR determining this Queſtion, we will firſt ſet down the Arguments which affirme it. Secondly, thoſe which deny. Thirdly, lay down ſome reſponſive concluſions, and anſwer the objections made againſt that part we take to be the truth.

Theſe who affirme the frame of Dioceſan Churches, vouch their Arguments: partly from Scripture, partly from preſidents, or inſtances ſacred and Eccleſiaſticall. Finally, from the congruity it hath with reaſon, that ſo they ſhould be conſtitute.

The firſt objection is taken from comparing thoſe two Scriptures, Titus 1. 5. Act. 14. 23. *Ordaine Elders City by City. They ordained Elders Church by Church.* Hence it is thus argued. They who ordained that a City, with the Suburbs and regions about it, ſhould make but one Church, they ordained a Dioceſan Church. But the Apoſtles, who uſe theſe phraſes as æquipollent, *To ordaine Presbyters in every City*, and *to ordaine them in every Church*, appointed, that a city with the ſuburbes and region about it, ſhould make but one Church. Ergo, the Apoſtles conſtituted a Dioceſan Church.

The reaſon of the propoſition is, becauſe Chriſtians converted in a City, with the ſuburbes, villages, and countries about it, could not be ſo few, as to make but a Pariſhionall Church. The Aſſumption is cleere, for theſe phraſes are uſed, as *ad æquate*, and being ſo uſed, needs it muſt be that the Apoſtles framed cities, ſuburbs, and regions into one church.

2 They argue from examples Sacred and Eccleſiaſticall. Sacred are taken out of the old and new Teſtament, Eccleſiaſticall, from the Primitive times, and from Patternes in our owne times: yea, even from ſuch churches, as we hold reformed, as thoſe in Belgia and Geneva.

To beginne with the church of the Jewes in the old Teſtament, whence they reaſon thus. That which many particular Synagogues were then (becauſe they were all but one Common-wealth, and had all but one profeſſion) that may many chriſtian churches now bee upon the like grounds. But they then, though many Synagogues, yet becauſe they were all but one Kingdome, and had all but one profeſſion, were all one nationall church. Ergo, upon like grounds many churches with us, in a nation or city, may be one nationall or Dioceſan church.

Secondly, the church of Jeruſalem in the New Teſtament is objected. 1 That which the Apoſtles intended ſhould be a head church to all Chriſtians in Judea, that was a Dioceſan church. But this they did by the church of Jeruſalem. Ergo: 2. That which was more numberſome, then could meet Pariſhionally, was no Pariſhional but Dioceſan church. But that church was ſuch. First, by growing to 3000. then 5000 Act. 2.41. & 4.4. then to have millions in it, Act. 21.20. Ergo, the church of Jeruſalem was not a Pariſhionall, but a Dioceſan church.

Thirdly, the church of Corinth is objected to have beene a Metropolitan church. He who writing to the church of Corinth, doth write to all the Saints in Achaia with it, doth imply that they were all ſubordinate to that church. But this doth Paul, 1 Cor. 2.1. Ergo. Secondly He who ſaluteth jointly the Corinthians and Achaians, and calleth the church of Corinth by the name of Achaia, and names it with preheminence before the reſt of Achaia, doth imply that the church of Corinth was the Metropolitan church to which all Achaia was ſubject. But the Apoſtle doth this, 2 Cor. 9.2. & 11. 11.8.9.10. Ergo.

Fourthly, that which was the mother city of all Macedonia, the church in that city muſt be, if not a Metropolitan, yet a Dioceſan church. But Philippi was ſo. Ergo.

The fifth is from the churches of Aſia, which are thus proved, at leaſt to have beene Dioceſan. 1. Thoſe ſeven churches which contained all other churches in Aſia ſtrictly taken, whether in city or country; thoſe ſeven were for their circuit, Metropolitan, or Dioceſan churches. But thoſe ſeven did containe all other in Aſia. Ergo. 2. He who writing to all churches in Aſia, writeth by name, but to thoſe ſeven, he doth imply, that all the reſt were contained in theſe. But Chriſt writing to the ſeven, writeth to all churches

churches in Asia, not to name that five of these were Metropolitan cities, viz. Philadelphia, and Pergamus, two Diocesan at least. 3. He who maketh the singular church he writeth to, to be a multitude of churches, not one onely (as the body is not one member onely) hee doth make that one church, to which he writeth in singular, to be a Diocesan church. But Christ in his Epiphonema ticall conclusion to every church, which he had spoken to in singular, doth speake of the same as of a multitude. *Let him that hath eares, heare what the Spirit saith to the Churches.* Ergo.

Thus leaving sacred examples, we come to Ecclesiasticall.

First, in regard of those ancient churches, Rome, Alexandria. It is impossible they should bee a Parishionall congregation 200. yeares after Christ. For if the multitude of christians did in Hierusalem so increase within a little time, that they exceeded the proportion of one congregation, how much more likely is it that christians in Rome and Alexandria did so increase in 200. yeares, that they could not keep in one particular Assembly? But the first is true. Ergo, also the latter. Which is yet further confirmed by that which Tertullian and Cornelius testifie of their times.

To come from these to our moderne reformed churches, these prove a Diocesan church. That respect which many congregations distinct may have now assembled in one place, that they may have severed in many places. For the unity of the place is but extrinsicke to the unity of the congregation. But many distinct congregations gathered in one city, may make, wee say, one church, as they doe in the Netherlands. Ergo, distinct congregations, severed in divers places may make one church. If many churches, which may subject themselves to the government of one Presbytery, may so make one, they may subject themselves to a bishop and cathedrall consistory, and so make one. But the 24. churches of *Geneva*, and the territories belonging to it, doe subject themselves to the government of one Presbytery, and so make one. For so farre as two meete in a third, they are one in it. Ergo.

The third principall Argument is from reason. If city churches onely, and not the churches of Villages, and country Townes, had bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons placed in them, then were those city churches Diocesan churches. But city churches onely had these. Ergo, city churches were Diocesan, distinguished from Parishionall churches. The Assumption is proved first by Scripture, Titus 1. 5. Act. 14. 23. Secondly, this is proved by Ecclesiasticall Story. They who are given to labour the conversion of the Regions, rather then tend those already converted, they were not given to a Parishionall church. But the

Presbyters

Presbyters planted by the Apostles were so. Ergo. They who were set in a church before Parishes were, could not be given to a Parishionall church. But such were the Presbyters of the Apostles institution, Ergo. For it is plaine in the practice of all ages, from the first division, that no church but the mother church had a Prebytery and a bishop, but Presbyters onely. Nay, it was ever by councels condemned, and by the judgement of the ancient forbidden, that in Townes or Villages, any but a Presbyter should be planted. 3. This is also proved by reason, for it was no more possible to have bishops and Presbyters in every Parish, then to have a Maior and Aldermen (such as we have in London) in every Towne. 2. If every Parish had a Presbyter, then had they power of ordination, and furnishing themselves with a Minister, when now they were destitute. But they were alwaies in this case dependant on the city. Ergo, there was then a Diocesan church having government of others. Presbyters could not ordaine, *sede vacante*, though they did at first, as in the church of Alexandria. Let any shew for 400. yeares a Parishionall church with a Presbytery in it.

Now we must muster those forces which oppose these Diocesan churches, allowing onely such churches to bee instituted of Christ, which may meet in one congregation ordinarily.

The word which without some modification super-added, doth signifie onely such a company as called forth, may assemble Politically, that word being alone, doth signifie such a church as may to holy purposes ordinarily meete in one. But the word *Church*, which Christ and his Apostles did institute; is used indefinitely, and signifieth no more, Ergo. *Ubi lex non distinguit, non est distinguendum.* 2. The Scripture speaketh of the churches in a Kingdome or Province, alwaies in the plurall number, without any note of difference, as equall one with the other. Ergo, it doth not know Provinciall, Nationall, or Diocesan churches. Let a reason be given, why it should never speake in the singular number, had they beene a singular church.

Secondly, let us come to examples: the churches the Apostles planted were such as might and did congregate.

First, that of Hierusalem, though there were in it toward 500. *Synagogues*, yet the christian church was but one, and such as did congregate into one place ordinarily after the accesse of 5000. to it. Act 2.46. & 5.12 & 6.1. & 15.25. & 21.22. & 25.22. For their ordinary meeting, as it is, Act. 2.46. *daily*, could not be a Panegericall meeting. Againe, if they might meete Synodically, why might they not meete then in daily course; though the universall meeting of a church is not so fitly called Synodicall: And though they

they are ſaid to be millions of beleevers, yet that was by accident of a circumſtance, happily the Paſſeover. We muſt not judge the greatneſſe of a water by that it is, when now it is up and ſwelleth by accident of ſome inundations. They had not a ſetled ſtate there, by which they did get the right of being ſet members. Yea, it is likely, they were and continued but one congregation. For forty yeeres after they were not ſo great a multitude, but that *Pella*, like to the *Zohar* of Lot, a little Towne could receive them. But more of this in the anſwer to the objection.

Secondly, ſo the Church of Antiochia, was but one Church, Acts 14. 27. they are ſaid to have gathered the Church together. Object. That is, the Miniſters, or repreſentative Church. Anſ. 1. For Miniſters onely, the Church is never uſed. 2. By analogie, Acts 11. *Peter* gave account before the whole Church, even the Church of the faithfull. *Ergo.* 3. They made relation to that Church, which had ſent them forth with prayer and impoſition of hands, and this Church ſtood of all thoſe who aſſembled to the publike ſervice and worſhip of God. 4. The people of the Church of Antioch were gathered together to conſider of degrees ſent them by the Apoſtles from Hieruſalem. τὸ πλῆθος.

Thirdly, the Church of Corinth was one congregation, which did for the ſervice of God, or exereiſe of Diſcipline meet together, 1 Cor. 5. 4. 1 Cor. 14. 25. verſ. 26. 1 Cor. 11. 17. verſ. 23. *in uno & eodem loco.* That whole Church which was guilty of a ſinner uncaſt forth, could not be a Dioceſan Church, neither can the word συνέρχεσθαι *comming together*, ever be ſhewed to ſignifie any thing elſe, beſides one particular Aſſembly.

Fourthly, the Church of Epheſus was but one flocke. Firſt, it is likely that it was of no other forme then the other. Secondly, it was but one flocke; that flocke which Presbyters might jointly feed, was but one. They had no Dioceſan Biſhop. If Presbyters onely, then none but Pariſh onall Churches in and about Epheſus. There may be many flocks, but God ordained none, but ſuch as may wholly meet with thoſe, who have the care of feeding and governing of them. *Peter* indeed, 1 Pet. 5. 2. calleth all thoſe he writeth to, one flocke: but that is in regard either of the myſticall eſtate of the faithfull, or in reſpect of the common nature which is in all Churches one and the ſame: but properly, and in externall adunation, one flocke is but one congregation. Thirdly, Pariſhes according to the adverſe opinion, were not then divided. Neither doth the long and fruitfull labours of the Apoſtles argue, that there ſhould be Pariſh Churches in Dioceſan wiſe added; but a greater number of ſmaller Churches. But when it is ſaid that all Aſia did heare: the

meaning is, that from hand to hand it did runne through Asia, so as Churches were planted every where, even where *Paul* came not, as at Colosse. There might be many churches in Asia, and many converted by *Peter* and others fruitfull labour without subordination of churches.

Examples Ecclesiasticall. 1. *Ignatius* exhorteth the church of the Ephesians, though numberlesse, to meete together often in one place, Epist. to the Ephesians, and to the Philippians: where the Bishop is, let the people be gathered to him, as where Christ is, there is the whole host of heaven. He calleth his church of Antioch a Synagogue of God, which cannot agree to a Dioceſan church: For these were particular congregations, opposed as to that Nationall church, so to all Provinciall and Dioceſan. Neither doth he call himselfe Bishop of Syria, but as he was, Bishop of the congregation in Syria, as a Minister stileth himselfe a Minister of the church of England.

2 *Justine* and *Ireneus* knew no kinde of church in the world which did not assemble on the Sabboth. But a Dioceſan church cannot.

3 *Tertullian* Apol. cap. 39. doth shew that all churches in his time did meet, and did worship God, in which prayers, readings, exhortations, and all manner of censures were performed. Hee knew no churches which had not power of censures within themselves.

4 Churches are said at first to have beene Parishes, and Parishes within cities, in Euseb. lib. 3 44. lib. 4. cap. 21. lib. 2. cap. 6. lib. 4. cap. 25. and Saint *John* lib 3. cap. 23. Suith to the Bishop, *redde juvenem quem tibi ego & Christus teste Ecclesia tua tradidimus.* That church in whose presence *John* might commit his *depositum*, or trust, was but one congregation, lib. 4. cap. 11. *Hyginus* and *Pius* are said to have undertaken the Ministery of the church of Rome: which church was such therefore, as they might minister unto, lib 7. 7. *Dionisius Alex.* writeth to *Xistus*, and the church which he governed. A Dioceſan church cannot receive letters. Before *Julian* and *Demetrius* his time, there is no mention of churches in a Bishops parish. The church of Alexandria was within the citie, lib. 7. cap. 2. *Cornelius* is said, *officium Episcopi impleviſſe in civitate Romæ ex Cyp. lib. 1. epiſt.* 3 Cornelius *Felicissimum ex Ecclesia pepulit qui cum tamen de provincia pellere non potuit. Vide Ruffinum, lib. 1. cap. 6. suburbicariarum Ecclesiarum tantum curam gessit.* *Cyprian* was Pastor *Parœciæ in Carthagine*, of the Parish in Carthage, *Euseb.* lib. 7. cap. 3. *ex verbis Cypriani*, lib. 1. epist. 4.

5 It is the rule of Scripture, that a Bishop should be chosen in sight of his people. Bishops were chosen long after by the people.

As

As of Rome, and others by the people committed to them. Cypr. lib. 4. epiſt. 1. Neighbour Biſhops ſhould come to the people over whom a Biſhop was to be ſet, and choſe the Biſhop in preſence of the people. Schiſmes were ſaid to be from thence, *Quod Epiſcopo univerſa fraternitas non obtemperat, Cypr. epiſt. 55. tota fraternitas i. unius congregationis tota multitudo, ex qua componitur Eccleſia particularis. Sabino de univerſæ fraternitatis ſuffragio Epiſcopatus fuit delatus.* Cypr. lib. 1. epiſt. 47. 58. 68. *Eccleſiæ igitur circuitus non fuit major, quàm ut Epiſcopus totam plebem ſuam in negotiis hujuſmodi convocare potuerit.* Soc. lib. 7. cap. 3. de Agapeto. *Convocavit omnem clerum & populum qui erat intra illius juriſdictionem.*

6 The Chorepiſcopi were Biſhops in Villages; there is no likelihood of the other notation. Their adverſaries in oppoſing them never object that they were as Delegates, or Suffragan Biſhops to them.

7 Biſhops were wont to goe forth to confirme all the baptized through the Dioceſſe.

8 They were neighbours, and might meet a dozen, ſix, three, in the cauſe of a Biſhop.

9 They were united, ſometimes in Provinciall Councels, in which many Biſhops met twice yearly, *Ruffin.* lib. 1, cap. 6. *Victor Uticenſis* reporteth in a time when they were feweſt in Africa in perſecution Vandalica, 660. fled to ſave themſelves. *Auſtin* ſaith there were innumerable orthodox Biſhops in Africa: and the Provinciall Councels doe confirme the ſame.

Now by reaſon it is cleare that churches were not Metropolitan or Dioceſan.

1 That church whoſe cauſes are wanting, that church is wanting. But in a Dioceſan church cauſes are not to be found. *Ergo.*

Firſt, the efficient cauſe, God ordeyning. For none can take on him to be a miniſter *Dioceſan:* no place to be a place, where the Aſſembly Dioceſan ſhould be held; no people can worſhip God in repairing to this place and miniſtery, without warrant of his word. *Ergo.* In the Nationall church of the Jewes, *Aaron* and his ſonnes tooke not that honour, it was given them: The place of the Nationall meeting, God choſe Hieruſalem. The people he preciſely bound to practiſe ſome ordinances of worſhip no where but there, and to appeare there before him. Secondly, the matter of a Dioceſan church is people within ſuch a circuit, obliged to meet at leaſt on ſolemne dayes, whereſoever the Dioceſan Miniſters and Ordinances of worſhip are exerciſed; Paſtors who have callings to tend them and miniſter to them in this Dioceſan meeting now aſſembled. Finally, the actuall meetings of them to ſuch end, as ſuch more ſolemne and publike meetings are ordained to, are no where com-

 manded,

minded, nor in any fashion were ever by any warrant of the Word practised.

If any say, these are not the causes of a Diocesan Church; but an ordinance of God binding persons within such a circuit to subject themselves to such a Church and the ministery thereof, that they may be governed by them

I answer. First, there is no ordinance of God for this, that can be shewed, that Churches within such a circuit should be tyed to a certaine head Church for government. Nay, it is false. For every Church by Christs institution hath power of government; and the Synagogue had in ordinary matters, the government that the Church of Jerusalem had; (being all over) except onely in some reserved causes. Secondly, I say, that this will not make a Diocesan Church formally so called. As a Nationall Church could not formally be without binding the whole Nation to exercise ordinances of worship in the head Church of it: So by proportion. Yea, government is a thing which doth now *accidere* to a Church constituted, and doth not essentially concurre as matter or forme to constitute a Church of this or that kinde. Againe, were this true, that the Diocesan Pastors and Ministers have onely government committed to them, then it will follow, that they onely have the governing of particular Churches, who are not any way Pastors of them, ministring Word and Sacraments to them. But this is most absurd, that their proper and ordinary Pastors, who dispence Word and Sacraments to them, should not have *potestatem regi*, nothing to doe in governing those flockes which depend on them. If any say, they were not *actu*, but they were *virtute potentiæ*: I say, it is also to make the Apostles Churches imperfect: and how can this be knowne but by a presumed intention, which hath nothing to shew it, but that after event of things.

From the effect I argue.

2 Those Churches which Christ did ordaine, and the Apostles plant, might ordinarily assemble to the ordinances of worship. But a Diocesan Church cannot ordinarily assemble. *Ergo.* For when God will have mercy and not sacrifice, and the Sabboth is for man, he will not for ever ordaine a thing so unequall and impossible, as is the ordinary assembling of a Diocesan multitude. If any distinguish the assumption, and consider a Diocesan as she is in her parts, or as she is *a totum*, standing of her parts now collected together, and say she may, and doth meet and communicate, and edifie her selfe in the first respect. I answer. This is nothing, and doth prove her to be nothing, as she is a Diocesan Church; *quia quid quid est, agit secundum quod est.* If therefore a Diocesan Church were a reall Church, she must have the effect of such a Church; to wit, assembling

assembling, as she is Diocesan. The Synagogues through Israel met Sabboth by Sabboth, but were no Nationall Church in this regard; that is to say, as it is a Nationall Church, it had her Nationall reall meetings.

I reason thirdly, from the subject.

3 That Church which doth *per se*, essentially require locall bounds of place, that must have locall limits set forth of God. But a Diocesan Church doth so. *Ergo*. Whence I thus inferre, He who institutes a Diocesan Church, must needs set out the locall bounds of this Church. But God hath not set out any locall bounds of the Church in the New Testament: *Ergo*. He hath not instituted any Diocesan Church. The proposition is certaine: for this doth enter in the definition of a Diocesan Church, as also of a Nationall. And therefore God instituting the Nationall Church of the Jewes, did as in a map set forth the limits of that Nation. So also if he had instituted Diocesan and Provinciall Churches, he would have appointed locall bounds, if not particularly described, yet knowne and certaine. But God hath not done this. For the Church of the New Testament is not thus tied to places; it being so with the power of teaching, and the Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, that it doth *respicere subditos* onely *per se*, not *terminos locales*. Civill jurisdiction doth *respicere solum* primarily, the subjects on it in the second place. As for that commandement of *appointing Presbyters Citie by Citie*, it is too weake a sparre for this building. Againe, that Church which may be said to be in a Citie, is not Diocesan. But the Churches which the Apostles planted, are said to be in Cities. *Ergo*. If one say to the proposition, they may; because the head Church is in the Citie. *Answer*. The Churches the Apostles planted are taken for the multitude of Saints united into such a body Ecclesiasticall. But the multitude of Saints through a Diocesse cannot be said to be in a Citie. *Ergo*. The soule may be said to be in the head, though it be in other parts; and God in heaven. God, because of his most infinite and indivisible nature: And so the soule, because it is indivisible, and is as all of it in every part, not as a thing placed in a place containing it, but as a forme in that which is informed by it. But in things which have quantity, and are part out of another, there is not the like reason.

4 From the adjuncts. That Church which hath no time set, wherein to assemble, is no Church. I suppose the ground above, that nothing but union of a Diocesse in worship, can make a Diocesan Church. But this Church hath no time. Ordinary it cannot have: extraordinary solemnities God hath not commanded. *Ergo*, there is no such Church. For if it be a reall Diocesan Church, it must have a reall action according to that nature of which it is. The action formall of a Church indefinite is to meet and communicate in worship. Of

a Nationall Church, is to meet nationally and communicate in ſhip. If then it muſt meet, it muſt have ſome time ſet downe, ordinary or extraordinary. But God hath done neither. The Churches, which the Apoſtles planted, were in their times moſt perfect and flouriſhing. But Dioceſan Churches were not: for in thoſe times they were but in *ſeminali* infolded, not explicated, as the adverſaries confeſſe.

4 That which maketh Gods diſpenſation incongruous to his miniſters, is abſurd. But a Dioceſan frame of Church doth ſo. *Ergo.* That which maketh God give his extraordinary gifts to miniſters of churches in the Apoſtles times, when now they had but one congregation, and give ordinary gifts onely when now they had 800. churches under them, is abſurd. But this doth the Dioceſan frame. *Ergo.*

5 The churches throughout which a Presbyter might doe the office of a teaching Presbyter, and a Deacon the office of a Deacon, were not Dioceſan. But every Presbyter might miniſter in the Word and Sacraments throughout the Church to which he was called; ſo might a Deacon tend to the poore of the whole church, whereof he was a Deacon. *Ergo*, theſe were not Dioceſan. The reaſon of the propoſition is; No Pesbyter can through many congregations performe ordinary miniſtery. In which regard the Canon law forbiddeth that Presbyters ſhould have many Churches, cap. 10. quæſt. 3. *Una plures Eccleſiæ uni nequaquam committantur Presbytero: quia ſolus per Eccleſias nec officium valet perſolvere, nec rebus earum neceſſariam curam impendere.*

6 If God had planted Dioceſan churches, that is, ordeined that all within citie, ſuburbs, and regions, ſhould make but one Dioceſan Church, then may not two Dioceſſes be united into one Church, or another Church and Biſhop be ſet within the circuit of a Dioceſan Church. But neither of theſe are ſo. The judgement of the African fathers ſhew the one, and the Canon law doth ſhew the other, pag. 2. cap. 16 41. Ergo:

7 If God appointed the frame of the church Dioceſan ſtanding of one chiefe church, others united in ſubjection: then can there not be the perfection of a church in one congregation: But where there may be a ſufficient multitude deſerving a proper Paſtor or Biſhop, requiring a number of Presbyters and Deacons to miniſter unto them, there may be the perfection of a church: But in ſome one congregation may be ſuch a multitude. *Ergo:*

8 Thoſe churches which may lawfully have Biſhops, are ſuch churches as God inſtituted: But churches in Townes, populous Villages, have had, and may have their Biſhops. *Ergo.* This is proved by κατὰ πόλιν every populous Towne, ſuch as our marker townes, and others; yea by

a *Synecdoche*, villages; for there they taught as well as in Cities. There were Synagogues in Villages, as well as in Cities. They excepted against them afterward in unconformity to Law. The testimony of *Zozomen* sheweth what kinde of congregations were they of which *Epiphanius* testifieth. And the fathers of Africa did not require, that a Diocesan multitude, but a sufficient multitude, not through every part, for then they should have had to doe in Citie churches, but in that part of the Diocesse where a Presbyter onely had served the turne, should have their Bishop.

If Diocesan churches, and Provinciall churches be Gods frame, then we had no Churches in Britaine of Gods frame, before that *Austin* was sent by *Gregorie* the great. But here were churches from before *Tertullian*, after the frame God requireth, at least in their judgements. *Ergo.*

Now to come to open the termes, and lay downe conclusions: whether Diocesan or Parishionall Churches were at the first constitute.

First, the word *Church* we understand here, not *figuratively*; taken *Metonymically* for the place, Synedd. for Ministers administring ordinances: but *properly*, for a body politick, standing of people to be taught and governed, and of teachers and governours.

Secondly, it may be asked, What is meant by a Diocesan church? *Answ.* Such a frame in which many Churches are united with one head Church, as partaking in holy things, or at least in that power of government which is in the chiefe Church, for all the other within such, or such a circuit. These phrases of a *Diocesse*, a *Diocesan Bishop*, or *Church*, are all since the time of *Constantine*, yea the two last much later. A Diocesse seemeth from the common-wealth to have [illegible]he taken up in the Church, from what time Bishops had Territories, ample demaines, and some degree of civill jurisdiction annexed to them. For a Diocesse by the Lawyers, is a circuit of Provinces, such as the Romans Præsidents had: or *active*, an administration of those Provinces with jurisdiction. *L. unica. C. ut omnes judicet.* And in the Canon law, sometimes *Provintia* and *Diocæsis* are used promiscuously, Dist. 50. cap. 7. But the ancientest use of this word was to note the Territory, or Countrey circuit, opposed to the Citie. Thus the Countrey churches are called *Diocesanæ Ecclesiæ, contur. cap.* 8.

Thus *Baptismales Ecclesiæ* were contra distinguished to Parishionall. These had every one a Diocesse, and the inhabitants were called *Diocæsani*: these Churches had a moity of houses dwelling in neighbourhood that belonged to them; but at length by a Synecdoche, the whole Church was called a Diocesse; though the Canonists dispute whether it may be so called, seeing the Diocesse is the

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
New York

the meaner part by much, in comparison of the Citie, and should not give the denomination to the whole. So at length the Bishop was called *Diocæsanus*, and the Church which had beene called *Ecclesia civitatis, matrix, nutrix, Cathedralis*, grew to be called *Diocesan*. But here we take a Diocesan Church for such a head Church, with which all Churches in such a circuit hath reall union, and communion in some sacred things. Now a Diocesan Church may be put *objectivè*, that is, for a Church in which are ministers and ministery for the good of the whole Diocesse, though they should never assemble, as the worship in the Church of Jerusalem was for all Judea, and profited, though absent. Or it may be put formally for a body politicke, a congregation of beleevers through a Diocesse, with the ministers of the same, having some reall union and communion in sacred things. We deny any such Church.

A Parishionall Church may be considered *Materially* or *Formally*; Materially, as it is a Church within such locall bounds, the members whereof dwell contiguously one bordering upon the other. This God instituted not, for it is accidentall to the Church, may *abesse* and *adesse*, a Church remaining one. If a Parishionall Church in London should dwell, as the Dutch doe, one farre enough from the other, while the same beleevers were united with the same governours, the Church were not changed, though the place were altered. Secondly, it is put formally, for a multitude which doe in manner of a Parish ordinarily congregate; such Churches, and such onely we say God erected.

Now for some Conclusions, what we agree in, then what severs us.

Conclus. 1. Churches of Cities, Provinces, Kingdomes, may be called Diocesan, Provinciall, Nationall Churches; as the Churches of the world are called Oecumenicall, yea haply not without warrant of Scripture: As 1 Pet. 1. 1. writing to all those dispersed Churches, speaking of them singularly, as of one flocke, 1 Pet. 5. 2. The reason is, things may be called not onely as they are really in themselves, but according to some respect of reason, under which we may apprehend them.

Conclus. 2. That there may be a reall Diocesan, Nationall, or head Church, wherewith others should be bound to communicate more solemnly in Word and Sacraments, and in some more reserved cases concerning their government. This was done in the Church of Judea. Our men are too shie, that feare to come to this proposition, *de posse*. I am sure our adversaries will grant us, that our Parishionall frame might have beene so constituted.

Conclus. 3. That there cannot be such a frame of Church, but by Gods institution. No Ministers can take this honour, but they must

(as *Haven*) be called to it. When nothing in nature can have further degree of perfection, then the author of nature putteth into it; how much more muſt the degree of perfection and eminence in things Eccleſiaſticall, depend on God? We may reaſon from the Church of Judea, as *à pari*, to prove, That there cannot be ſuch a Church, but that all ſubordinates muſt communicate with the chiefeſt head Church in ſome ſacred things, which may make them one Church. Thus there would not have beene a Church Nationall of the Jewes, but that all the Nation had union and communion together even in the worſhip and ordinances of worſhip. The men onely went up, ſo the male onely were circumciſed: but the female repreſentatively went up in them.

Obiect. It is enough if the communion be in government, which all our oppoſites grant neceſſary.

Anſw. This maketh then rather one *in tertio quodam ſeparabili*, then one Church: government being a thing that commeth to a Church now conſtituted, and may be abſent, the Church remaining a Church. The firſt Churches of Biſhops, when now they were divided, did keep all other, who were the Biſhops presbyters ſtrictly ſo called, and the people alſo in ſome communion with the head Church; for in greater ſolemnities one and other went up thither. See *decret. diſt.* 3. *diſt.* 38.

Concluſ. 4. We agree in this, that Churches were in their firſt planting, either not actually Dioceſan, being one congregation without any other ſubordinate, or if they had any, yet were they imperfect, wanting many parts or members of particular Churches, which belonged to them.

That wherein we contradict one another, is, we affirme that no ſuch head Church was ordained either virtually or actually, but that all Churches were ſingular congregations, equall, independent each of other, in regard of ſubjection. Secondly, we ſay, were there a Dioceſan granted, yet will it not follow, that Pariſh churches ſhould be without their government within themſelves, but onely ſubject in ſome more common and tranſcendent caſes. As it was with the Synagogues and that Nationall Church of the Jewes, and as it is betwixt Provinciall and Dioceſan Churches. If any ſay there is not the ſame reaſon of a Dioceſan Church and Pariſhionall: for that hath in it all the perfection of a Church. I anſwer, not; taken in compariſon to a Provinciall Church, it is but a part and member, and hath not perfection, no more then a parochiall Church hath, compared with a Dioceſan.

Now followeth to anſwer the Arguments firſt propoſed.

To the firſt, I anſwer to the propoſition by diſtinction. Thoſe who ordained that the *Civitas* and *Vrbs* people taken in regard of the

whole multitude of the one, and locall bounds of the other, should make but one Church, they did institute a Diocesan church. But those who so instituted a Church in City, Suburbs, Countrey that their number might bee compared fitly to one congregation, they did not therefore ordaine a Diocesan Church. Againe to the assumption. But those who use *City by City*, and *Church by Church* as equivalent (which the Apostles doe) they ordained that City, Suburbs, and Country should make but one Church. I answer by the like distinction. They who use *City by City*, people being taken for the whole multitude within the extent of these locall bounds, as equivalent with *Church by Church*, they may be said to have ordained that city, suburbs and territories, should make but one Church. But thus the Apostles doe not use them, as of equall signification. For the City had a reason of an ample continent, the Church of a thing contained. These phrases are, the one proper, the other metonymicall, and are therefore to bee expounded the one by the other. Hee placed Presbyters κατὰ πόλιν, lest we should understand it of the multitude and locall bounds, it is said in the Acts of the Apostles that they placed them κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, Church by Church: because Presbyters were not given but to Disciples and Christians now converted out of the multitude and locall limites wherewith cities were bounded. Secondly, there is an *adæquate* acception of these phrases *per accidens*, not because the citie and church was to make but one church, but because the Christians by occasion of their number, not being then too great, were framed into one church; or because by occasion there was yet but one church, not because there was to be but one. Now hee who thus useth them promiscuously, doth imply that one church was as yet constituted, not that there was to be but one through the circuit of city, suburbs, and countrey. Thus likewise it is easily answered to the proofe of the propositon: For thus the multitude of citizens converted and unconverted, could not be a church of one congregation yet the number of those who in city, suburbs, and territories, were actually converted, was no more then might be ordered into one church, and the Apostles framing these into one on the present occasion, did not exclude the after constituting of any other within the same locall bounds.

To the second Argument: and first, the objection from the Nationall church of the Jewes. I answer, denying the assumption. That the Synagogues being many, made one church; because they were all one Kingdome, one possession. For thus there was one Oecumenicall church, when the world was under one Emperour

Emperour, and of one profeſſion. It is accidentall to the unity of a Church whether the kingdome be one or no. If Iſrael, when God had divided the kingdome into two, had gone up to Hieruſalem, and kept there communion in the worſhip of that Church, they had ſtill been one Church, though two Kingdomes. If there were as many Kings and Kingdomes as have beene in England, ſo many as ſhould belong to one Provinciall Church, ſhould bee one Church, though many Kingdomes. The truth is, they were one Church, becauſe they had union and Nationall communion in the ordinances of worſhips, which were in that one Church to which they all belonged. The high Prieſt was their proper Prieſt, hee made interceſſion for them, bleſſed them, they were not to offer any where, but there. If any thinke this cannot bee the cauſe, why there were one Church, under the governement of one high Prieſt, for then ſhould *Aaron* have beene as well as *Melchiſedeck*, a type of Chriſts Kingly office. I anſwer there is *Prieſtly* Prelacy and governement, as well as *Princely*: They were under *Aaron* in the former regard, in which he was a ſhadow of Chriſt.

To the ſecond inſtance of Hieruſalem; we deny the propoſition. It might be intended for a head and mother Church in regard of order, and yet not bee a Nationall Church having power over others: If it ſhould have beene a head, having power accordingly, as it was a mother Church, it ſhould have beene head to all the world. Secondly, wee deny the Aſſumption. That the Apoſtles ever intended, that it ſhould be a head to Chriſtian Churches through Judea: as it had beene before under the High Prieſt. That conſtitution was typicall, and may better plead for an univerſall Chriſtian Church, then for a Nationall. Secondly, there is not the leaſt intimation of Scripture this way. Thirdly, had this Divinity beene knowne, the Fathers would not have ſuffered, that it ſhould have beene made a Dioceſan church, and ſubjected to Cæſarea. To the Proſillogiſme. The Church which was ſo numberſome, that it could not meete ordinarily, could not bee a Pariſhionall Church. This was ſo. Ergo, &c. To the propoſition I anſwer, That which was by inhabitants, who had *fixum domicilium*, ſo numberſome that it could not meete, I grant it. But ſo this was not; by accident often many others were there *in tranſitu*. Secondly, nay wee read that they did meete ordinarily, as is above ſaid, and in that deliberation about which the Church of Antioch did ſend to them, *Irenæus* affirmeth, *l.* 3. *c.* 12. *Univerſam eam convenisse.*

Luke affirmeth the ſame. As for that of millions of beleevers, it is certaine, they were not fixed members of this Church. For would Luke, who reckoneth the growth of them to five thouſand, have concealed ſo notable acceſſions, where by they ſay, they grew up to I know not how many thouſands; there is no likelihood. Whether therefore they were ſuch beleevers as are mentioned, Iohn 2. or whether by reaſon of the Paſſeover, or Penteeoſt, or ſuch like feaſt, they were in *tranſitu*, onely there for the preſent. How ever it is, there is no likelihood that they were conſtant members of that Church, Nevertheleſſe, ſay, they were more then could fitly meet, yet might they be tollerated as in one Congregation. The Apoſtles ſeeing ſuch times to enſue, wherein many of them ſhould tranſlate themſelves, and be diſperſed hither and thither. God letting it grow a while more ranke and aboundant then ordinary Churches are to be, becauſe it was *Eccleſiæ ſuricularis*, many of whoſe branches were to be tranſplanted in their time. Yea, had there beene five thouſand ſetled members, we read of ſome ordinary Auditories, ſpoken to by ordinary Paſtors, as great; as *Chryſoſtome* on *Actib.* 24. doth ſignifie, to his eſteeme they might be five thouſand that then heard his voyce.

Touching the third inſtance, As to the firſt reaſon, The propoſition is denyed: for naming the reſt of Achaia with them, doth no more ſignifie the ſubjection of all Achaians, then in the 1 *Corinth.* 1.2. naming all Saints in every place, doth ſignifie their ſubjection. The ſecond reaſon, hath the ſequell of the propoſition denied: for the contrary is rather true. He who without any note of difference calleth the church of Corinth by the name of Achaia, he doth imply that it is but one particular church equall with the other churches in Achaia. To the third, the propoſition is againe denied, That he that ſpeaketh of all the churches as one, doth imply a metropolitan church. For by the firſt concluſion we may ſpeake of things not onely as they are really, but according to any reſpect of reaſon, under which they are apprehended. Againe, the aſſumption is falſe: He ſpeaketh not of them as one church, but as divers churches in one Province. But it is named and ſet before others. Ergo. &c. The ſequell is againe denied. For it may be named before other, becauſe it is the moſt illuſtrious and conſpicuous church; but not becauſe it hath any power over other. Finally, it is too groſſe to thinke, that all in Achaia came to Corinth to be inſtructed and make their contributions, every church uſing the firſt day of the weeke when they aſſembled to make their collections within themſelves.

The

The fourth instance is *Crete*, where the many churches in that Iland, so full of cities, are said to be one church of Crete, whereof *Titus* was Bishop. Those manifold churches which made but one, whereof *Titus* was Bishop, those were all one Nationall church. But the churches of Crete, as saith the subscription, were so. Ergo. Answ. The propcsition might be questioned on the ground above: but the assumption is false: proved by a subscription, which is like his proofe, which was brought out of the booke after the Revelation. For first they are not in the Syriacke testament. Secondly, they are nor thought of Antiquity ancienter then Theodoret. Thirdly, the subscription is false, and most unlikely: For had Paul written from Nicopolis, he would have wished Titus to come to him to Nicopolis, where he was for the present, and meant to winter, rather then have spoken of it as a place from which he was absent, and whether he meant to repaire.

The fifth instance. Phillip. 3. That church, which was in the chiefe citie of Macedonia, must needs be at least a Dioceſan. But the church of Philippi was so. Ergo. This will prove an argument, when churches must needs be conformed to the civill regency of the Emperour: his foure chiefe Governours called *præfecti prætorii*, his presidents of Provinces under them, and inferiour Judges, and Magistrates, under these in one citie, and the regions of it. But this is an errour giving ground to a Patriarchall and Oecumenicall church, as well as a Provinciall and Dioceſan. This rule of planting churches varieth at mans pleasure: For the Romane Provinces after the people of Rome gave up their right to the Emperour, were brought all into one, under one head and Monarch, and Provinces have beene diversly divided from time to time. From this Monarchie arose the Popes plea against the Greeke churches for his Oecumenicall soveraignty. What forme of churches must we have amongst them who never received any such government, nay any constant government at all. If I were a conformitant I should object otherwise for a Provinciall church in Philippi: viz thus. That church which had many Bishops in it could not be Parishionall nor Dioceſan, but Provinciall. For the Provinciall church hath the Metropolitan and Suffragan Bishops in it, and no other. But Philippi had so. Ergo. But the Propoſition is true onely when it is understood of Dioceſan Bishops, not of Parishionall Bishops. Paul writeth not to the Bishops in the church, but in the citie: Now many Bishops are not in the Provinciall citie, though many are in a Provinciall church.

Now to come to the churches of Asia. I answer to the propoſition of the first Syllog. by distinction. One church may conteine others, as an example doth conteine in it a thing exemplified: or

as a head Church doth Churches united in ſubjection to it. Thoſe Churches which conteine all other in the latter ſence, it is true, they were at leaſt Dioceſan: but in this ſenſe the aſſumption is denyed. The ſame anſwer fitteth the Proſyllog. He that writing to theſe, writeth to all other by vertue of their ſubjectionall ſubordination, he doth imply that all others are conteined in theſe as member Churches under one head. But he who writing to theſe, writeth to all other as exemplified onely in them, he doth not imply any ſuch thing. Now this is manifeſt, becauſe he writeth to ſeven Churches: whereas this were ſuperfluous, if Chriſt did intend his letter onely to head Churches conteyning other. For then five Churches ſhould have beene written to onely, ſeeing in them all others were conteyned, as they ſay. For by law of this virtuall continency, Philadelphia and Thiatira were included in two of the other, viz. Sardis, and Pergamus, which were their mother cities. What needed he have named Philadelphia and Thyatira, which by law of this virtuall continency did intend to direct his letter onely to head Churches? Againe, the aſſumption is falſe: For he doth write principally to the ſeven, and to all other Churches in Aſia no further then he writeth to all the Churches in the world. There were other Churches in Aſia, ſuch as were Coloſſe, Hierapolis, Troas, the Church at Miletum, and Aſſos, which the Centuries mention, which depended not on thoſe ſeven. If Coloſſe and Hierapolis were not, as Laodicæa, reedified when John did write the Revelation, yet theſe other Churches were not extant. Not to name Magneſia and Tralles, the independancy whereof is fully cleared whatſoever Doct. Downam objecteth.

To the third reaſon; from Chriſts manner of concluding his Epiſtles, it is anſwered by denying the aſſumption. For Chriſt doth not uſe the plurall number in reſpect of that one Church preceding, but in reſpect of the ſeven collectively taken, it being his will that the members of each ſingular Church ſhould lay to heart both ſeverally and joyntly, what ever was ſpoken to them and to others.

Now to come to the Eccleſiaſticall examples, as of Rome, and Alexandria, two hundred yeares after Chriſt. And firſt to anſwer the reaſon brought for their increaſe, ſuch as could not keepe ſtill in a Pariſhionall meeting. The propoſition is not of neceſſary conſequence; for there were very extraordinary reaſons of that which was effected in the Church of Jeruſalem: From Chriſt himſelfe, from the reſidence of all the Apoſtles; from the ſtate of the people there aſſembled; from the ſtate of that Church; from the time in which theſe were done. Chriſt

had

had prayed for them particularly, to which ſome attribute the firſt miraculous converſion by Peters preaching. Againe, it was fit, that being now aſcended into his glory, he ſhould there more aboundantly diſplay his power, and more conſpicuouſly ſwallow up the ſcandall of his croſſe. Againe, this Church had the labour of all the Apoſtles for a time in it: whoſe care and induſtry we may gueſſe by their ordination of Deacons, that they might not be diſtracted. Thirdly, the confluence and concourſe to Hieruſalem was of much people, who though explicately they did not beleeve in Chriſt; yet had in them the faith of the Meſſiah, and therefore were neerer to the kingdome of God then the common Heathen. The ſtate of this Church was ſuch, that it was to ſend out light to all others, a common nurſery to the world. Finally, the time being now, the beginnings of planting that heavenly Kingdome, ſeeing beginnings of things are difficult, no wonder if the Lord did reveale his arme more extraordinarily. It doth not therefore follow from this particular, to the ſo great encreaſing of theſe churches in tract of time. Nay, if theſe other Churches had enjoyed like increaſe in their beginnings, it would not follow, as thus. *Thoſe Churches which within a few yeares had thus many in them, how numberſome were they many yeares after?* Becauſe the growing of things hath a Period ſet, after which, even thoſe things which a great while encreaſed, doe decreaſe and goe downward, as it was in Jeruſalem. Not to mention, that we deny the aſſumption.

But though the Argument is but Topicall, and can but breed an opinion onely, yet the teſtimonies ſeeme irrefragable. Tertullian teſtifying that halfe the Citizens in Rome was Chriſtians. And Cornelius, that there was beſides himſelfe, and 45. Presbyters, a numberſome Clergie.

I anſwer, That Tertullians ſpeech ſeemeth to be ſomewhat Hyperbolicall; for who can beleeve that more then halfe the Citie, and world, after a ſort, were Chriſtians? But he ſpeaketh this, and truely in ſome regard, becauſe they were ſo potent through the world, that if they would have made head they might have troubled happily their perſecutors. Or elſe he might ſay they were halfe of them Chriſtians, not becauſe there were ſo many members of the Church: but becauſe there were ſo many who did beare ſome favour to their cauſe, and were it as ſafe as otherwiſe, would not ſticke to turne to them. But Tertullian knew no Churches which did not meet, having prayers, exhortations, and miniſtering all kindes of cenſures: If therefore there were more Churches in Rome in his time, it will make little for Dioceſan Churches.

Touching

Touching *Cornelius*: we answer, It is not unlike but auditories were divided and tended by Presbyteries. *Cornelius* keeping the Cathedrall Church, and being sole Bishop of them: but we deny that these made a Diocesan Church. For first, the Cathedrall and Parochiall Churches were all within the Citie, in which regard he is said, *Officium Episcopi implevisse in civitate Roma.* Neither was his Church as ample as the Province, which that of Fœlicissimus sufficiently teacheth. Secondly, we say that these Parochiall churches, were to the mother church, as chappels of ease are to these churches *in metrocomiis*, they had communion with the mother church, going to the same for Sacraments and hearing the Word, and the Bishop did goe out to them and preach amongst them. For some of them were not such as had liberty of Baptizing, and therefore could not be severed from communion with the head Church.

Now to answer further, it is beyond 200. yeares for which our defence is taken. For there is reason why people which had beene held together for 200. yeares as a Congregation, might now fifty yeares after be exceedingly encreased. The Ecclesiasticall story noteth a most remarkeable increase of the faith, now in the time of *Julian* before *Cornelius*. Neither must we thinke that an Emperour, as *Philippus*, favouring the faith, did not bring on multitudes to the like profession. Secondly, we say, there is nothing in this of *Cornelius* which may not well stand, that the Church of Rome, though now much increased, did not keepe together as one Church. For the whole people are said to have prayed and communicated with the repentant Bishop, who had ordeyned *Novatus*: and we see how *Cornelius* doth amplifie *Novatus* his pertinacie: From hence, that none of the numerous Clergie, nor yet of the people, very great and innumerable, could turne him, or recall him, which argueth that the Church was not so abundant, but that all the members of it had union and communion, for the mutuall edifying and restoring one of another. And I would faine know, whether the seven Deacons, seven Subdeacons, two and forty Acolouthes, whether those exorcistes, Lectors, Porters about two and fifty are so many, as might not be taken up in a Congregation of fifteene or twenty thousand? Surely the time might well require them, when many were to be sent forth to doe some part of ministery more privately. Not to name the errour of the Church in superfluous multiplications of their Presbyters, to vilifying of them, as they were superfluous in the point of their Deacons. There were sixty in the church of Sophia for the helpe of the Liturgie. True it is, the Congregation could not but be exceeding great, and might well be called in a manner innumerable, though it were but of a twenty thousand people. But because of that which is reported touching division by *Evaristus*, *Hyginus*, *Dionisius*, and *Marcellinus*;

Marcellinus, though there is no authenticke authour for it; neither is it likely in Hoſpinianus judgement. Let it be yeelded that there were ſome Parochiall diviſions, they were not many, and within the Citie, and were but as Chappels of eaſe to the cathedrall or mother Church.

Concerning the objection from the Churches of Belgia, or the low Countries, we deny the propoſition: for we cannot reaſon thus: *If many Maſters, and diſtinct formes of Schollers, in one free Schoole, be but one Schoole: then many Maſters and company of Schollers, ſevered in many Schooles, are but one Schoole.* Secondly, they have communion in the community of their Teachers, though not in the ſame individuall word tended by them. But it is one thing, when ſheepe feed together in one common Paſture, though they bite not on the ſame individuall graſſe: Another thing when now they are tended in diverſe ſheepe gates. Not to urge, that in the Sacraments and Diſcipline, they may communicate as one Congregation.

Touching the objection from Geneva: I anſwer to the propoſition by diſtinction. *Thoſe who ſubject themſelves to a Presbyterie, as not having power of governing themſelves within themſelves, as being under it by ſubordination, theſe may in effect, as well be ſubject to a Conſiſtorie: But thus the twenty foure Churches of Genevæ doe not.* They or have power of governing themſelves, but for greater edification, voluntarily confederate, not to uſe nor exerciſe their power, but with mutuall communication, one asking the counſell and conſent of the other in that common Presbytery. Secondly, it is one thing, for Churches to ſubject themſelves to a Biſhop and Conſiſtory, wherein they ſhall have no power of ſuffrage: Another thing to communicate with ſuch a Presbytery, wherein themſelves are members and Judges with others. Thirdly, ſay, they had no power, nor were no members in that Presbytery, yet it is one thing to ſubmit themſelves to the government of Ariſtocraſie, another to the Biſhops Monarchicall government. For while his Presbyters are but as Counſellours to a King, though he conſulteth with them, he alone governeth. Geneva made this conſociation, not as if the Prime Churches were imperfect, and to make one Church by this union: but becauſe though they were intire Churches, and had the power of Churches, yet they needed this ſupport in exerciſing of it, and that by this meanes the Miniſters and Seniors of it might have communion. But what are all the foure and twenty Churches of Geneva to one of our Dioceſan Churches?

Now to anſwer the reaſons. The firſt of them hath no part true: the propoſition is denyed. For theſe Churches which had ſuch Presbyters and Deacons as the Apoſtles inſtituted were Pariſhionall, that is, ſo conjoyned that they might and did meet in one Congregation.

The Doctor did consider the slendernesse of some of our Parishes, and the numbersome Clergy of some Cathedrall Churches, but did not consider there may be Presbyteries much lesser, and Congregations ampler and fuller, and yet none so bigge as should require that multitude he imagineth, nor made so little as might not have Presbyters and Deacons. What though such Maior and Aldermen as are in London cannot be had in every Towne, yet such a Towne as Cambridge may have a Maior and Aldermen as Cambridge affoords, and the meanest market Towne may have, though not in degree, yet in kinde like Governours. So is it in Presbyters and other Officers: the multitude of Presbyters falling forth *per accidens*, not that a Bishop is ever to have a like numbersome Presbyterie, but because the Church is so numbersome that actions liturgicall require more copious assistance, and so wealthy that it can well maintaine them. And beside, because of that Collegiate reason which was in them rather then Ecclesiasticall, which the fathers had in their Presbyteries; for the nursing of plants, which might be transplanted for supply of vacant Churches, which was a point that the Apostles in planting Churches no whit intended.

To come to the assumption: *But city Churches onely had a Bishop with Presbyters and Deacons.* Answer, First, not to stand upon this, that Saint *Paul* set no Bishops with Presbyters, but Presbyters onely, and they say Bishops were given, when the Presbyters had brought the Church to bee more numbersome, the assumption is false, that *Citie Churches onely had them.* For the Scripture saith, they planted them Church by Church, that is, through every Church. Then every Church had her Governours within her selfe, wee must use as ample interpretations as may be. Contrarily, the sense which arrogateth this to one from the rest wee cannot without evidence receive it, *in ambitiosis restricta interpretatio adhibenda est. Ecclesia* doth not signifie any Church without difference, Parishionall, Diocesan, or Provinciall; but onely a company orderly assembling, not ἀγορὰ but ἐκκλησία νομιμὴ καὶ ὠρισμένη. Such a company therefore as congregate decently to sacred purposes is a Church by translation. Besides the indefinite is equivalent to the universall, as, κατὰ πόλιν is καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν, so κατ' ἐκκλησίαν is καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλησίαν. Now their interpretation beggeth everything without any ground. For when Presbyters may be taken but three waies: *divisim, conjunctim*, and *divisim*, and *conjunctim*: *divisim* one Presbyter in one, another in another, *conjunctim*, diverse Presbyters in every Church, neither of these will serve their turne, the latter onely being true: for Scripture making two kinds of Presbyters, without which the Church cannot be governed, it is sure it did give of both kinds to every Church they planted,

ted. Now they seeing some Churches in our times to have many, and some one conster it both waies *Collective*, many Presbyters, & *Singularly*, one here, and one there, and because many Presbyters cannot be thus placed in our frame of Churches, imagine the Church to containe Parochiall and Diocesan Churches.

But they will not seeme to speake without reason; the Scripture say they placed City by City Presbyters, and therefore in such Churches as occupied Citie, Suburbes, and Countrey, which Parishionall ones doe not. But may not a Church of one Congregation be in a Citie, without occupying limits of Citie, Suburbes, and Countrey? and if Presbyters be placed in such a Church, may they not bee said to be placed in Cities? Indeed if the Presbyters placed in Cities were given to all the people within such bounds; the case were other; but the citie is not literally thus to be understood, but metonymically for the Church in the Citie. Neither was the Church in the city, all within such bounds; for the Saints of a place and Church of a place, are all one in the Apostles phrase of speech. As for that which is objected from Ecclesiasticall history, it is true, that in processe of time, the Bishop onely had a company of Presbyters. Before, Churches kept in one Congregation and had all their Presbyters. Churches should so have afterward beene divided, that all should have beene alike for kinde, though in circumstantiall excellency some were before other. What a grosse thing is it to imagine, that the first frame the Apostles did erect was not for posterity to imitate? A fitter example then to take out of the custome of *Metropoles*, who sending out there ἀποικίας, or *Colonies*, doe use to reserve some cases in civill jurisdiction over them, which the state of later Churches did expresse.

THE SECOND QVESTION, WHETHER *CHRIST* ORDAINED by himselfe, or by his Apostles, any ordinary Pastor, as our Bishops, having both precedency of order, and majority of power above others.

WE will follow the same method: First, setting downe the arguments for it, with answers to them: Secondly, the arguments against it. Thirdly, lay downe conclusions. The arguments for it are: First, taken from Scripture: secondly, from practise of the Churches: thirdly, from reason evincing the necessity of it.

The first Argument.

Those whom the holy Ghost instituted, they are of Christs ordaining. But the holy Ghost is said to have placed Bishops, Acts 20. Ergo, Bishops are of Christs ordaining.

Answer. We deny the assumption: viz. That those Presbyters of Ephesus were Diocesan Bishops. It is most plaine they were such who did *Communi consilio* tend the feeding and government of the Church; such Bishops whereof there might be more then one in one congregation. The common glosse referreth to this place that of *Jerom*: that at first Presbyters did by common councell governe the Churches. Yea, Doct. *Downam* doth count Ephesus as yet to have had no Bishop, who was sent unto them after *Pauls* being at Rome, as he thinketh. And others defending the Hierarchie, who thinke him to have spoken to Bishops, doe judge that these words belong not to the Presbyters of Ephesus, but are spoken in regard of others together then present with them, to wit, of *Timothy*, *Sosipater*, *Tychicus*, who, say

ſay they, were three Biſhops indeed; but that he ſpeaketh of theſe who indeed were in company, is quite beſides the text.

The ſecond Argument.

Such Paſtors as the ſeven Angels, Chriſt ordained. But ſuch were Dioceſan Biſhops. Ergo. The aſſumption proved. Thoſe who were of ſingular preheminency amongſt other Paſtors, and had corrective power over all others in their Churches, they were Dioceſan biſhops. But the Angels were ſingular perſons in every Church, having Eccleſiaſticall preheminence and ſuperiority of power. Ergo, they were Dioceſan biſhops. The aſſumption is proved. Thoſe who were ſhadowed by ſeven ſingular Starres, were ſeven ſingular perſons. But the Angels were ſo. Ergo. Againe, Thoſe to whom onely Chriſt did write, who onely bare the praiſe, diſpraiſe, threatning, in regard of what was in the Church amiſſe, or otherwiſe: they had Majority of power above others. But theſe Angels are written to onely, they are onely praiſed, diſpraiſed, threatned. Ergo. &c.

Anſw. 1. In the two firſt ſyllogiſmes the aſſumption is denyed. Secondly, in the firſt Proſyllogiſme the conſequence of the propoſition is denied, That they muſt needs be ſeven ſingular perſons. For ſeven ſingular ſtarres may ſignifie ſeven Vnites, whether ſingular or aggregative: ſeven pluralities of perſons who are ſo united as if they were one. And it is frequent in Scripture to note by a unity, a united multitude. Thirdly, the conſequence of the propoſition of the laſt proſyllogiſme is denyed. For though we ſhould ſuppoſe ſingular perſons written to, yet a preheminency in order and greater authority, without majority of power, is reaſon enough why they ſhould be written to ſingularly, and blamed, or praiſed above other. Thus the Maſter of a Colledge, though he have no negative voyce, might be written to, and blamed for the miſdemeanours of his Colledge, not that he hath a power over-ruling all: but becauſe ſuch is his dignity, that did he doe his endeavour in dealing with, and perſwading others, there is no diſorder which he might not ſee redreſſed. Fourthly, againe the aſſumption may be denyed: That they are onely written to. For though they are onely named, yet the whole Churches are written to in them; the ſupereminent member of the Church by a Synecdoche put for the whole Church. For it was the cuſtome in the Apoſtles times, and long after, that not any ſingular perſons, but the whole Churches were written unto, as in *Pauls* Epiſtles is manifeſt, and in many examples Eccleſiaſticall. And that this was done by Chriſt here, the Epiphonemaes teſtifie. *Let every one heare what the ſpirit ſpeaketh to the Churches.*

The third Argument.

Thoſe whom the Apoſtles ordained, were of Apoſtolicall inſtitu-

on. But they ordained Bishops. Ergo. The assumption is proved by induction.

First, they ordained *James* Bishop of Jerusalem presently after Christs ascention. Ergo. they ordained Bishops. This is testified by *Eusebius, lib. 2. Histo. cap. 1.* out of *Clement* and *Hegesippus*: yea, that the Church he sate in was reserved to his time, *lib. 7. cap. 19. & 32.* This our owne author *Ierom* testifieth, *Catalog. Script. Epiph. ad hær. 66. Chrysost. in Act. 3. & 33. Ambros. in Galath. 1. 9. Dorotheus in Synopsis. Aug. contra Cres. lib. 2. cap. 37.* the generall Councell of Const. in Trull. cap. 32. For though hee could not receive power of order, yet they might give him power of jurisdiction, and assigne him his Church. So that though he were an Apostle, yet having a singular assignation, and staying here till death, he might justly be called the Bishop, as indeed he was. If he were not the Pastor, whom had they for their Pastor?

Secondly, those ordinary Pastors who were called Apostles of Churches in comparison of other Bishops and Presbyters; they were in order and majority of power before other. But *Epaphroditus* was the Apostle of the Philippians, though they had other called Bishops. Chap. 1. 4 Ergo. The assumption; that he is so called as their eminent Pastor, is manifest by authorities. *Ierom. in Phil. 2. Theod. and Chrysost.* on the same place. Neither is it like this sacred appropriate name should bee given to any in regard of meere sending hither or thither. Yea this, *that he was sent*, did argue him there Bishop: for when the Churches had to send any where they did usually intreate their Bishops.

Thirdly, *Archippus* they instituted at Colosse. Ergo.

Fourthly, *Timothy* and *Titus* were instituted Bishops, the one of Ephesus, the other of Crete. Ergo. The Antecedent is proved thus. That which is presupposed in their Epistles, is true. But it is presupposed that they were Bishops in these Churches. Ergo. The assumption proved. Those whom the Epistles presuppose to have had Episcopall authority given them to bee exercised in those Churches, they are presupposed to have beene ordained bishops there. But the Epistles presuppose them to have had Episcopall authority given them to be exercised in those Churches. Ergo. The assumption proved. 1. If the Epistles written to *Timothy* and *Titus*, bee patternes of the Episcopall function, informing them, and in them all bishops, then they were bishops. But they are so. Ergo. 2 Againe, whosoever prescribing to *Timothy* and *Titus* their duties as governours in these Churches, doth prescribe the very dutie of bishops, hee doth presuppose them bishops. But *Paul* doth so: For what is the office of a bishop beside teaching, but to ordaine and governe: and governe with singularitie

gularity of preheminence, and majority of power in comparison of other. Now these are the things which they have in charge, *Tit.* 1. 5. 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. 1 *Tim.* 1 3. 11. 2 *Tim.* 2. 16. Ergo. 3. Those things which were written to informe not onely *Timothy* and *Titus*, but in them all their successours who were Diocesan Bishops, those were written to Diocesan bishops. But these were so. Ergo, to Diocesan bishops. Now that Diocesan bishops were their successours, is proved. 1. Either they, or Presbyters, or Congregations. Not the latter. 2. Againe, Those who did succeed them were their successours. But Diocesan bishops did. Ergo. The assumption is manifest by authorities. In Ephesus from *Timothy* to *Stephanus* in the Counsell of Chalcedon. And in Crete, though no one is read to have succeeded, yet there were bishops Diocesan. And we read of *Phillip* bishop of Gortina the Metropolis. 4. Those who were ordinarily resident, and lived and died at these Churches, were there bishops. But *Timothy* was bid abide here, *Titus* to stay to correct all things, and they lived and died here. For *Timothy* it is testified by *Hegisippus*, and *Clement* and *Eusebius* out of them, whom so refuse to believe, deserve themselves no beliefe. Ergo, they were there bishops. Againe, Jerom. in Cat. Isidorus de vita & morte Sanct. Antonius par. 1. Tit. 6. cap. 28. Niceph. lib. 10. Cap. 11. these doe depose, that they lived and died there. Further, to prove them bishops. 5. Their function was Evangelicall and extraordinary, or ordinary; not the first, that was to end. For their function as assigned to these Churches, and consisting especially in ordaining and jurisdiction, was not to end. Ergo. Assumption proved. That function which was necessary to the being of the Church, was not to end. But the function they had as being assigned to certaine Churches, is necessary to the being of the Church, Ergo, &c. 6. Finally, that Antiquity testifieth, agreeing with Scripture, is true. But they testifie that they were bishops, which the subscriptions of the Epistles also affirme. Ergo. Eusebius Lib. 5. Cap. 4. Dyonis. Areopag. Doroth. in Synopsi. Ambrose præm. in 1. Tim. 1. Jerom. 1. Tim. 1. 14. 2. Tim. 4. in Catalo. Chysostom. in Philip. 1. Epiph. in Hær. 5 Primas. prefat. in 1. Tim, 1. 1. Theod. præfat. in Tit. Oecum. Sedulius. 1. Timoth. 1. as it is said in the booke of histories. Greg. Lib. 2. Cap. 12. Theoph. in Ephes. 4. Niceph. lib. 2. Cap. 34.

Answer.

We deny the assumption of the first Syllogisme, with all the instances brought to prove it.

First, for *Iames*, we deny he was ordained bishop, or that it can be proved from antiquity, that he was more then other Apostles. That which *Eusebius* reporteth, is grounded on *Clement*, whom wee know to be a forged magnifier of Romish orders, and in this story he doth seeme

seeme to imply, that Christ should have ordeyned *Peter*, *John* and *James* the greater Bishops. Seeing he maketh these to have ordeyned *James* after they had got of Christ the supreme degree of dignity, which these forged deceitfull Epistles of Anacletus doe plainely affirme. Secondly, as the ground is suspected; so the phrase of the Fathers, *Calling him the Bishop of that Church*, doth not imply that he was a Bishop properly so called. The Fathers use the words of *Apostoli* and *Episcopi* amply, not in their strict and formall propriety. *Ierom* on the first to the Galathians, and in his Epistle to *Damasus*, affirmeth, that the *Prophets* and *John* the Bishop might be called Apostles. So many Fathers call *Phillip* an Apostle. *Clem. 5. Const. cap. 7. Euseb. lib. 3. cap. ult. Tertul. de Bapt. cap. 8.* and others. In like manner they call the Apostles Bishops; not in propriety of speech, but because they did such things as Bishops doe, and in remaining here or there made resemblance of them. Thus *Peter*, *Paul*, *John*, *Barnabas*, and all the rest, are by the Ancients called Bishops.

Object. This is granted true, touching others, but not in this instance of *James*: because it is so likely and agreeable to Scripture, as well as all other Story; that when all the rest of the Apostles departed out of Jerusalem, *John* the Baptist did still abide with them even to death. Answer. Though this be but very conjecturall, yet it nothing bettereth the cause here. It followeth not, He did abide with this Church. Ergo, he was the proper Bishop of this Church. For not abiding in one Church doth make a Bishop: but he must so abide in it, that he must from the power of his office, onely be bound to teach that Church: secondly, to teach it as an ordinary Pastor of it: thirdly, to governe it with a power of jurisdiction, limited onely to that Church. But *James* was bound to the rest of the Circumcision by his office, as they should from all the world resort thither. Secondly, he did not teach but as an Embassadour extraordinarily sent from Christ, and infallibly led by his Spirit into all truth. Ergo, not as an ordinary Bishop. Thirdly, as the rest in what Provinces soever they rested, had not their jurisdiction diminished, but had power occasionally, as well where they were not, as where they were; so it was with *James*. This might happily make the phrase to be more sounded out of *James*, that he did in this circumstance of residing, more neerely expresse an ordinary Pastor then any other. It is plaine, Antiquity did hold them all Bishops, and gather them so to be, *a Priori & Posteriori*: the Author *de quæst. vet. & nov. test. cap. 97. Nemo ignorat Episcopos salvatorem Ecclesiis instituisse prinsquam ascenderet: imponens manus Apostolis, ordinavit eos in Episcopus.* Neither did they thinke them Bishops because they received a limited jurisdiction of any Church; but because they were enabled to doe all those things which none but Bishops could regularly

regularly doe. *Oecum. cap.* 22. *in Act.* It is to bee noted, saith hee, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* had the dignity of Bishops: for they did not make Bishops onely, but Presbyters also. Now wee must conster the ancient, as taking them onely eminently and virtually to have been Bishops, or else wee must judge them to have been of this minde, That the Apostles had both as extraordinarie Legats, most ample power of teaching and governing suting thereto, as also the ordinary office of Bishops and Pastors, with power of teaching and governing, such as doe essentially and ministerially agree to them: which indeed Doctor *Downam* himselfe confuteth, as Popish, and not without reason, though while hee doth strive to have *Iames* both an Apostle and a Bishop properly, himselfe doth confirme it not a little.

Wherefore it will not be unprofitable to shew some reasons why the Apostles neither were nor might be in both these callings.

First, That which might make us doubt of all their teaching, and writing, is to bee hissed forth as a most dangerous assertion. But to make *Iames*, and so any of them, have both these offices in proprietie, might make us doubt. Ergo. The assumption proved thus. That which doth set them in office of teaching liable to errour, when they teach from one office, as well as infallibly directed with a rule of infallible discerning, when they teach from the other, that doth make us subject to doubting in all they teach and write. But this opinion doth so. Ergo. The proposition is, for ought I see, of necessarie truth, the assumption no lesse true. For if there bee any rule to direct *James* infallibly, as hee was formally the ordinary bishop of Jerusalem, let us heare it: if there were none, may not I question, whether all his teaching and writing were not subject to errour? For if hee taught them as an ordinarie bishop, and did write his Epistle so, then certainly it might erre. If he did not teach them so, then did hee not that hee was ordained to, neither was hee properly an ordinary Pastor, but taught as an extraordinarie Embassadour from Christ.

Secondly, Those offices which cannot bee exercised by one, but the one must expell the other, were never by God conjoyned in one person. But these doe so. Ergo. The assumption is manifest. Because it is plaine, none can be called to teach as a Legat extraordinarie, with infallible assistance, and unlimited jurisdiction, but he is made uncapable of being bound to one Church, teaching as an ordinary person, with jurisdiction limited to that one Church. Againe, one can no sooner bee called to doe this, but at least the exercise of the other is suspended. Thirdly, that which is to no end, is not to bee thought to bee ordained of God. But to give one an ordinarie authority, whereby to doe this or that in a Church, who

had a higher and more excellent power of office, whereby to doe those same things in the same Church, is to no end. Ergo.

Object. But it will be denied that any other power of order, or to teach and administer sacraments was given, then that he had as an Apostle: but onely jurisdiction or right to this Church as his Church.

Answer. To this I reply, first, that if hee had no new power of order, he could not be an ordinary Bishop properly and formally so called. Secondly, I say power of governing ordinary was not needfull for him who had power as an Apostle in any Church where hee should come. *Object.* But it was not in vaine, that by assignation hee should have right to reside in this Church as his Church. *Answer.* If by the mutuall agreement in which they were guided by the spirit, it was thought meete, that *James* should abide in Jerusalem, there tending both the Church of the Jewes, and the whole circumcision, as they by occasion resorted thither, then by vertue of his Apostleship hee had no lesse right to tend those of the circumcision by residing here, then the other had right to doe the same in the Provinces through which they walked. But they did thinke it meete that hee should there tend that Church, and with that Church all the Circumcision, as they occasionally resorted thereto. Ergo. For though hee was assigned to reside there, yet his Apostolicke Pastorall care was as *Johns* and *Peters*, towards the whole multitude of the dispersed Jewes, Galath. 2. Now if it were assigned to him for his abode, as hee was an Apostolicke Pastor, what did hee need assignation under any other title. Nay he could not have it otherwise assigned, unlesse wee make him to sustaine another person, viz. of an ordinary Pastor, which hee could not bee who did receive no such power of order as ordinary Pastors have.

Fourth'y, that calling which hee could not exercise without being much abased, that hee never was ordained unto, as a point of honour for him. But he could not exercise the calling of an ordinary Bishop, but hee must bee abased. Hee must bee bound by office to meddle with authority and jurisdiction but in one Church, hee must teach as an ordinary man liable to errour. Ergo, hee was never ordained to bee a Bishop properly. If it bee sacrilege to reduce a Bishop to the degree of a Presbyter, what is it to bring an Apostle to the degree of a Bishop? True it is, hee might have beene assigned to reside constantly in that Church without travelling, and be no whit abased; but then he must keepe there a Pastor of it with Apostolicall authority, caring not for that Church, but the whole number of the Jewes, which hee might doe without travelling. Because

cauſe who ſo keeped in that Church, hee did neede to goe forth as the reſt; for the Jewes from all parts come to him. But he could not make his abide in it as an ordinary teacher and governour, without becomming many degrees lower then hee was. For to live without going forth, in the mother Church of all the world, as an ordinary Paſtor, was much leſſe honour then to travaile as *Peter* one while into Aſſyria, another while through Pontus, Galatia, Bithinia, as an Apoſtle. Even as to ſit at home in worſhipfull private place is leſſe honourable then to goe abroad as Lord Embaſſadour hither or thither. Honour and eaſe are ſeldome bedfellowes. Neither was *James* his honour in this circumſtance of the reſt, but in having ſuch an honourable place wherein to exerciſe his Apoſtolicke calling. As for that queſtion, who was their ordinary Paſtor, it is eaſily anſwered. Their Presbyters, ſuch as *Linus*, or *Clemens* in Rome, ſuch as Epheſus and other Churches had. *Iames* was their Paſtor alſo, but with extraordinary authority. What needed they an ordinary Biſhop, which grew needfull (as the favourers of the Hierarchy ſay) to ſupply the abſence of Apoſtles, when now they were to deceaſe? What needed then here an ordinary Biſhop where the Apoſtles were joyntly to keepe twelve yeares together, and one to reſide during his life, according to the current of the ſtory? Thus much about the firſt inſtance.

To the ſecond inſtance of *Epaphroditus*, and the argument drawen from it. Firſt, we deny the propoſition. For had ſome ordinary Paſtors beene ſo ſtiled, it might imply but a prehemencie of dignity in them above other: wherefore unleſſe this be interſerted, it is unſound, viz. *Thoſe ordinary Paſtors, who are called Apoſtles in compariſon of others, becauſe the Apoſtles did give to them power of ordination, juriſdiction, and peradventure prehemincncy, which they did not give to others, they are above others.* Secondly, the Aſſumption is falſe altogether: Firſt, that *Epaphroditus* was an ordinary Paſtor: Secondly, that hee was called an Apoſtle in compariſon of inferiour Paſtors of that Church. *Obj.* But the judgement of *Ierom, Theodoret, Chryſoſtome*, is that he was. *Anſw.* The common judgement is, that he was an egregious teacher of theirs, but further then this, many of the teſtimonies doe not depoſe. Now ſo he might be: for he was an Evangeliſt, and one who had viſited and laboured among them, and therefore might be called their teacher, yea an egregious teacher, or Doctor of them. Nay, Saint *Ambroſe* doth plainely inſinuate, that he was an Evangeliſt: for he ſaith he was made their Apoſtle by the Apoſtle, while he ſent him to exhort them, and becauſe he was a good man, he was deſired of the people. Where hee maketh him ſent, not for perpetuall reſidence amongſt them, but for the tranſient exhorting of them, and maketh him ſo deſired of the

Philippians, becauſe hee was a good man, not becauſe hee was their ordinary Paſtor. *Ieroms* teſtimony on this place doth not evince. For the name of Apoſtles and Doctors is largely taken, and as appliable to one, who as an Evangeliſt did inſtruct them, as to any other. *Theod.* doth plainly take him to have been as their ordinarie biſhop, but no otherwiſe then *Timothy* and *Titus*, and other Evangeliſts are ſaid to have been b ſhops: which how true it is, in the next argument ſhall bee diſcuſſed. For even *Theodoret* doth take him to have beene ſuch an Apoſtolicke perſon as *Timothy* and *Titus* were. Now theſe were as truly called biſhops as the Apoſtles themſelves. Neither is the rule of *Theodoret* to bee admitted: for it is unlike that the name of Apoſtle ſhould bee communicated then with ordinarie Paſtors, where now there was danger of confounding thoſe eminent Miniſters of Chriſt, with others, and when now the Apoſtles were deceaſed, that then it ſhould ceaſe to bee aſcribed to them. Againe, how ſhall wee know that a biſhop is to bee placed in a Citie, that hee muſt bee a perſon thus and thus (according to *Pauls* Canons) qualified: all is voided, and made not to belong to a biſhop. For thoſe who are called biſhops, were Presbyters and no biſhops, biſhops being then to be underſtood onely under the name of Apoſtles and Angels. Thirdly, antiquity doth teſtifie, that this was an honour to biſhops, when this name was Eccleſiaſtically appropriated to them. But if they ever had been tearmed by the name of Apoſtles before, this had been a debaſing of them. Neither is there reaſon why they ſhould bee called Apoſtles. In juriſdiction Apoſtolicall the Apoſtles were not ſucceeded. Juriſdiction Epiſcopall they never exerciſed, nor had, and therefore could not bee ſucceeded in it. The Apoſtles gave to Presbyters that which Chriſt gave them out of his power; even the power of ordinary government. They are bid ποιμαίνειν, and βόσκειν, to feed as well by government as doctrine. They are bid not to play the Lords over the flock. What feare of tyranny where there is no power of government? But lay authorities aſide, conſider the thing from the text it ſelfe. Firſt, *Paul* ſeemeth but occaſionally to ſend him, hee having purpoſed to have ſent *Timothy*, who as yet could not bee imployed. *I thought it neceſſary to ſend Epaphroditus to you.* Secondly, hee doth imply, that *Epaphroditus* had not returned to them, but that hee ſent him; and that therefore hee was not the ordinary biſhop of it. It is like, hee was but ſent till *Timothy* might bee diſpatched to them. Neither is it any thing probable he ſhould bee called an Apoſtle, as their ordinary and eminent Paſtor. In the Scriptures, none are ſaid to be Apoſtles further then they are in habitude to ſome ſending them. Now this is undoubted, the Philippians had ſent him to *Paul*. It is then moſt probable when he is

called

called their Apostle, it is in regard he was sent by them, which the Apostle pointeth at in the next words, *who hath ministred to me the things needfull which you sent by him.* Object. But it is unlikely that this word appropriated to the Twelve, should be used of those sent civilie. Not so, for while the persons sending are signified, they are sufficiently contradistinguished; it being the Priviledge of the Apostles, that they were the Apostles of Christ Jesus, not simply that they were Apostles. Secondly, *Iohn* 13. It is made common to all that are sent. For though Christ meane it of himselfe, yet he implies it by a discourse, *a genere ad speciem.* Thirdly, we see the like phrase, 2 Cor. 8. *The Apostles of the Churches.* For *Chrysostome* there understandeth those whom the Churches had sent for that present. That doth not hinder, they were by *Paul* to the Churches, therefore the churches might not send them with their contributions. Neither is this an argument that he was their bishop, because their church sent him: for they sent Apostles themselves and Evangelists also more ordinarily, it being their office to goe from church to church, for the edification of them.

For the instance of *Archippus* I finde it not urged.

Now to come to the last instances of *Timotheus* and *Titus.*

First, we deny the Antecedent, that they were instituted bishops by *Paul.* And in the first prosillegisme we deny the Assumption: *that the Epistles doe presuppose so much.* And to the prosillogisme, tending to prove this assertion denyed, we answer: first, to the proposition, by distinguishing the Episcopall authority, which is considered both in regard of that which is materiall, and in regard of the formall reason which doth agree to it. The Proposition is true, understanding it of authority in both these regards; those who are presupposed to have had authority Episcopall given them, both for the substance of it, and the formall reason which doth agree to it in an ordinary bishop, they are presupposed bishops: but this is denyed. For they are presupposed to have and exercise power Episcopall for the materiall of it, as Apostles had also; but not to have and exercise in that manner and formallity which doth agree to a Bishop, but which doth agree to an Evangelist, and therefore they are bidden to doe the worke of an Evangelist, to exercise all that power they did exercise as Evangelists. There is nothing that *Paul* writeth to *Timothy* to doe in *Ephesus*, or to *Titus Crete*, which himselfe present in person might not and would not have done. If wee should reason then thus: Hee who did exercise Episcopall power in these churches, he is presupposed to have beene bishop in them. This proposition is not true, but with limitation: Hee who exercised Episcopall power after that formall manner, which doth agree to the office of a Bishop, hee was Bishop; but not hee who exerciseth the

power *ſecundum aliam rationem & modum*: viz. after ſuch a manner as doth agree to an Apoſtle.

To the ſecond maine proofe, wee deny the propoſition. If patternes for Biſhops, then written to Biſhops. The reaſon is, Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, ordinary Paſtors, have many things common in their adminiſtration. Hence is it, that the example of the one may be a patterne to another, though they are not identically and formally of one calling. Councells have enjoyned all Presbyters to be well ſeene in theſe Epiſtles, as being patternes for them, *Vide Aug. De doctrin. Chriſt. cap. 16. lib. 4.*

To the third reaſon. *Who ſo preſcribing them their duties doth propoſe the very duties of Biſhops, hee doth take them to have beene Biſhops.* The Propoſition is not true without a double limitation. If the Apoſtle ſhould propoſe ſuch duties of Biſhops as they in later times uſurped, he doth not therefore preſuppoſe them biſhops, becauſe theſe are duties of Evangeliſts, agreeing to biſhops onely by uſurpation. Againe, ſhould he propoſe thoſe duties which, ſay they, the word doth aſcribe and appropriate to biſhops, yet if he doe not preſcribe them as well in regard of matter as forme exerciſed by them, it will not follow that he doth take them for biſhops: nor that *Paul* doth purpoſe the very duties of biſhops, both in ſubſtance and manner of performance. Secondly, we deny him to purpoſe for ſubſtance the duties of biſhops. For hee doth not bid him ordaine, as having a further ſacramentall power then other Miniſters, nor governe with power directive and corrective over others. This exceedeth the bounds of all miniſteriall power. Thirdly, *Timothy* is not bid to lay on hands or doe any other act, when now churches were conſtituted, but with concurrence of thoſe churches; *ſalvo uniuſcuiuſque Eccleſiæ iure*, the Apoſtles did not otherwiſe. For though *Paul* wrote to him alone, that was becauſe he was occupied not onely in churches perfectly framed, but alſo in the erecting and framing of others. Secondly, becauſe they were in degree and dignity above all other ordinar governours of the Church, which their Conſul-like preheminencye was ſufficient, why they ſhould be written to alone.

To the fourth reaſon: *Thoſe things which were written to informe, not onely Timothy and Titus, but all their ſucceſſours, who were Dioceſan Biſhops, thoſe were written to Dioceſan Biſhops. But theſe were ſo, Ergo.* The Propoſition is not true, becauſe it preſuppoſeth that nothing written to any perſons, can informe Dioceſan biſhops, unleſſe the perſons to whom it is written be formally in that ſelfe ſame order. For if one Apoſtle ſhould write to another touching the duty Apoſtolique, it might informe any Doctor or Paſtor whatſoever. Secondly, wee deny Dioceſan biſhops are (*de iure*) ſucceſſours. As for the

equivocall

equivocall Catalogue which maketh all who are read bishops to have beene Diocesan, we shall speake of them hereafter. The bishops betweene *Timothy* and *Stephanus* in the time of the *Chalcedon* Councell, were not all of one cut: and there are no churches read in *Crete* which were not Congregations. There is no more to prove *Phillip* of *Gortina* a Metropolitan, then to prove *Ignatius* Metropolitan of Syria: For what doth story relate, but that *Phillip* was amongst other a bishop of those Churches which were in Crete. There are many Churches in England, a Minister of which Churches is such an one, that is one Minister amongst others of those Churches. To that of their residing there and dying in these Churches. First, the proposition is not necessary. For as *Iames* might reside exercising an Apostolicall inspection in a particular Church, so might these exercise an Evangelicall function how long soever they resided. Secondly, the assumption will not bee found true for ordinary constant residence neither in Scripture nor fathers. For *Timothy*, though he be exhorted to stay at Ephesus, yet this doth not argue it, that he was enjoyned ordinary residence. For first it was a signe he was not bishop, because *Paul* did exhort him, for he would well have knowne, he might not, being their ordinary Pastor leave them, further then the more important good of the Church should occasion. 2. He is bid to stay there, not finally, but till the Apostle should come to him, which though he might be delayed, it is plaine he then intended. So *Titus* is placed in *Crete*, not to stay there, and set downe his rest, but ἐπιδιορθώσαι, further to set, as it were, and exedifie the fabricke, which *Paul* had begun. God gave Ceremonies μεχρὶ καιροῦ διορθωσεως διόρθωσις, is not ever a correcting of any thing amisse, but a setling every thing right, by erecting the substance foreshadowed. But say it were correcting, it were but such a correction as one might performe *in transitu*, with a little longer stay, though not ordinary residence By Scripture the contrary is manifest.

For first, it is not like that *Timothy* was placed bishop after *Paul* being at Rome; for when *Paul* saith he prayed him, when now hee was going to Macedonia, to stay at Ephesus, he doth intimate that when hee left him they were there both together. Secondly, when he wished him to abide there, hee had a meaning to come unto *Timothy* thither where he left him, so as at least to call on him, and see the Church. But *Paul* after his parting from the Presbyters knew he should never see the Ephesians more. Act. 20. If wee say he doth foretell it for likely, so we may say, that of wolves arising was, and call all into question. Neither is it likely, but that teares would have broke his heart, and made him yeeld in the peremptories of his speech, had not his soule beene divinely perswaded. Thirdly, he had no meaning when he left them to constitute

Timothy

Timothy to be their Bishop: for he would not have omitted such an argument of consolation to hearts so heavy. Nor he doth not mention any such purpose when he did write to them his Epistle. Hee telleth. Churches usually when himselfe hath meaning to see them, or to send others. Fourthly, Timothy was with Paul while hee was in bonds at Rome, as witnesse those inscriptions of the Epistles to the *Colossians* and *Philippians*; yea *Timothy* was so with him, as to bee imployed by him, sent forth, and returne to him, which is manifest. Philip. 2. If he were after this placed in *Ephesus*, yet he was not placed to be resident, for in the end of the Epistle, he doth bid *Timothy* come to him, and bring *Marke*, that they might minister to him. Againe when hee did write the 2. Epistle, *Timothy* was not *Ephesus*, for he doth bid him salute *Aquila* and *Priscilla* and *Onesiphorus*. Object. But is like these were at *Ephesus*, for there *Paul* left *Aquila* and *Priscilla*. They came occasionally, they did not fixe there, which *Chrysostome* also judgeth. And the house of *Onesiphorus*, *Bernard* taketh it, was at Iconium in Lycaonia, so that it is like he was in his native country at this time, even Iconium, Listra, Derbe, which happily is the cause why the Scholasticall story doth make him Bishop of Lystra, because hither he was last sent. He was so here, as that the Apostle did but send him to see them, for hee biddeth him come before winter. Besides, there are many probalities he was not at *Ephesus*, for he speaketh of it through the Epistle, as a place now remote from him. *Thou knowest what Onesiphorus did for mee at Ephesus*, not *where now thou art. I have sent Tychius to Ephesus, not to thee*, to supply thy place while thou shalt bee absent. Finally, after *Paules* death hee did not returne to Ephesus, but by common consent went to *Iohn* the Apostle, and very little before his death came to Ephesus, if ever. As for the Fathers therefore in this point, if they testifie ordinary residence, which they doe not, wee have liberty to renounce them; but they testifie onely that he remained in that Church, because his stay was longer there then Evangelists did use to make, and he is thought to have suffered martyrdome there. So for *Titus*, when *Paul* sent him to Crete to doe that worke is uncertaine; but this is certaine, it was before his writing to the Corinths the second time, and going to Rome. This likewise: that *Paul* was then in travelling, and as it is like being in the parts of Macedonia did mean to winter at *Nicopolis*. When he did write the Epistle he doth shew it was not his meaning that *Titus* should stay there, for hee doth bid him to meete him at Nicopolis, where he meant to be as it is likely, but *Titus* comming did not meete him there, but at length found him in Macedonia, whence *Paul* did send him to the Corinthians, *thanking God for his promptnesse even of his owne accord to be imployed amongst them*, 2 Cor. 8. 16. which doth

shew

ſhew he had not beene made an ordinary biſhop any where. We find that he did accompany *Paul* at Rome, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. and when *Paul* writ his ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, he was in Dalmatia. Whence *Aquinas* doth thinke him to have beene biſhop of that place. Wherefore wee thinke him that will bee carried from ſuch preſumptions, (yea manifeſt arguments) by *Hegeſippus*, *Clemens*, and hiſtory grounded on them, to be too much affected to ſo weake authors, and wiſh not credit with him, who counts him unworthy credit, that will not ſweare what ſuch men depoſe.

Touching the proofe that followeth, *That either function was Evangeliſticall and extraordinary, or ordinary. But their function as aſſigned to thoſe Churches was not extraordinary.* We deny this aſſumption, with the proofe of it. *That the function that theſe exerciſed as aſſigned to certaine Churches (theſe two by name) was neceſſary to the being of the Church.* The reaſon is, becauſe they were aſſigned to doe thoſe things which are to be done for ever in the church after a more tranſcendent manner; viz. as Evangeliſts; and aſſignation of them to doe thoſe things in certaine Churches after this manner, was not neceſſary to perpetuate the being of the Church. Aſſignation to churches to doe the worke of ordinary Paſtors is indeed neceſſary: not aſſignation to doe the worke of Evangeliſts.

To that finall reaſon, what antiquity doth teſtifie agreeing with Scriptures is true, and ſo to be taken. What they ſpeake ſo agreeing, that it is virtually conteined in them, and may rightly be deduced from them, is to bee beleived and received by a divine faith. But what they ſpeake not plainely contradicted, but yet no way included, may be admitted *fide humana*, if the firſt relators be well qualified witneſſes. But what they ſpeake from ſuch as *Clement* and *Hegeſippus*, it is is in effect of light credulity. A corrupt conſcience bent to decline is glad of every colour which it may pretend to juſtifie it ſelfe in declining.

To the aſſumptiō we anſwer. What do not ſome ancient enough cal *Timothy*? *Ambroſe* ſaith he was a Deacon one while, a Presbyter another while, & in like ſenſe others a Primate & a Biſhop. *Lyra* proveth him from many authorities to have been an Arch-biſhop, and *Titus* a Prieſt. *Beda* calleth him an Apoſtle. But to gather on theſe, that he was in propriety of ſpeech all theſe, were abſurd. Object. I, but they call him biſhop on other grounds, becauſe aſſigned to this Church. Anſw. They call him biſhop becauſe he was aſſigned to this Church, not onely to teach, but alſo to ordaine Deacons, Presbyters. For whereſoever they found this done, and by whomſoever, they did call them biſhops, as I noted before from *Oecumen.* The fathers therfore may be well conſtrued calling theſe biſhops, becauſe they made longer ſtay in theſe Churches then Evangeliſts did uſually, & did preach

and ordaine, and doe in theſe Churches all ſuch things which Biſhopes in their time uſed to doe. But that he was not an Evangeliſt, and more then an ordinary biſhop they do not deny. *Salmeron* himſelfe in his firſt Diſputation on 1 *Tim. pag. 405. Videtur ergo quod fuerit pluſquam Epiſcopus, etiamſi ad tempus in ea civitate ut Paſtor prædicaverit & ſacros ordines promoverit, unde quidem vocant eum Epiſcopum.* Finally, ſhould they in rigour and formall propriety make him an ordinary Paſtor from the firſt time *Paul* did write to him ordinarily reſident to his end; they ſhould teſtifie a thing, as I hope I have ſhewed, contrary to Scripture, yea contrary to that text which maketh him to have done the worke of an Evangeliſt. As for the ſhew from the Subſcriptions we have ſpoken ſufficiently.

Now to ſhew that they were not properly biſhops. Firſt, we have ſhewed that they were but ſubrogated to doe thoſe ſuppoſed Epiſcopall duties a while, but were not there fixed, to make their ordinary abode. Therefore not biſhops properly. Secondly, they who did the worke of an Evangeliſt in all that they did, did not perform formally the worke of a biſhop. But theſe did ſo. As is vouched of *Timothy*, *Doe the worke of an Evangeliſt*. Ergo. The Propoſition is proved. If an Evangeliſt and biſhop cannot be formally of one office, then the act of an Evangeliſt, and the act of an ordinary Paſtor or biſhop cannot be formally one. For when every thing doth *agere ſecundum quod actu eſt*, thoſe things which are not the ſame formally, their worke and effect cannot be formally the ſame. But the Evangeliſt and the ordinary Paſtor or biſhops, are not formally the ſame. Ergo. The aſſumption the Apoſtle proveth, by that diſtinct enumeration of thoſe whom Chriſt gave now aſcending by the worke of the Miniſtery to gather and build his Church. For as an Apoſtle is diſtinguiſhed from a Prophet, a Prophet from an Evangeliſt, ſo an Evangeliſt from an ordinary Teacher.

Object. But it may be ſaid, they were not diſtinct, but that the ſuperiour contained the inferiour, and Apoſtles might be Evangeliſts properly, as *Matthew* and *John* were.

Anſw. That former point is to be underſtood with a graine of ſalt. The ſuperiour contained the inferiour virtually and eminently, in as much as they could doe *altiori tamen ratione*, what the inferiour did. This ſenſe is tollerable. But that formally the power of all other offices ſuites with the Apoſtles, is falſe. My Lord chiefe Juſtice of England is not formally a Conſtable. As for the latter, true, an Apoſtle might be alſo a penmen of the Goſpell, but this maketh not an Evangeliſt more then an Apoſtle, but doth *per accidens*, come to them both. And even as a Preacher or Paſtor, writing Commentaries, and publiſhing other Treatiſes, this commeth *per accidens* to his calling, it doth not make him a Paſtor, but more illuſtrious

ſtrious and fruitfull in that regard then another. So *Matke* and *Luke* was not therefore Evangeliſts becauſe they did write the Goſpels, for then none ſhould have beene Evangeliſts that had not written, but in this regard they were more renowned then other. Cuſtome hath ſo prevailed, ſaith *Maldonate* in his Preface on *Matthew*, that wee call them Evangeliſts, (*viz.* the Writers of the Goſpells) whom the Scriptures never call Evangeliſts. Theſe Evangeliſts *Paul* ſpeaketh of were given at Chriſts aſcenſion, but the firſt writer of the Goſpell, being an Apoſtle, was at leaſt eight yeares after. Secondly, they were a diſtinct order of workemen from the Apoſtles, but two of the penmen of the Goſpels were Apoſtles. Thirdly, they were ſuch as by labour of miniſtery (common for the generall of it to all other) did gather Saints, and build Chriſts Body. Now writing the Goſpell was not a labour of Miniſtery common to Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors, but the publiſhing of it.

Thoſe degrees which Chriſt did diſtinctly give to otherſome, and otherſome, thoſe he did not give conjoynedly to one and the ſame perſons. But theſe callings he gave to ſome one, to others another. Elſe he muſt have ſaid, he gave the ſame men to be Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, the ſame to be Evangeliſts and Paſtors. Ergo.

That calling which is not compatible with the calling of an Evangeliſt, that *Paul* never annexed to an Evangeliſt. But the calling of a biſhop is ſuch. For a biſhop is tyed to a particular Church. The calling of an Evangeliſt is a calling whereby one is called to the worke of the Miniſtery, to gather Saints, and edifie Chriſts body, without any limitation to any particular Church. Ergo, *Paul* never annexed the calling of a biſhop to an Evangeliſt.

The calling of an Evangeliſt is not to write the Goſpell, nor to preach it ſimply; for then every Miniſter of the Word ſhould be an Evangeliſt. But this doth difference them, to preach it without limitation or aſſignation to any particular church. Thus *Philip* thus all thoſe who were the Apoſtles helpers, working the work of the Lord as they did were Evang. of which ſort ſome continued to the time of *Commodus* the Emperour, as *Euſebius* reporteth, *Euſeb. hiſt. li 5. cap. 9.* Now a calling whereby I am thus called to publiſh the Goſpel, without fixing my ſelfe in any certaine place; and a calling which bindeth during life to ſettle my ſelfe in one Church, are incompatible.

Laſtly, that which would have debaſed *Timothy* and *Titus*, that *Paul* did not put upon them. But to have brought them from the honour of ſerving the Goſpell, as *Collaterall* companions of the Apoſtles to be ordinary Paſtors, had abaſed them. Ergo, this to be ordinary Paſtors *Paul* did not put upon them. *Object.* The aſſumption is denyed, it was no abaſement. For before they were but Preſbyters, and afterward by impoſition of hands were made biſhops.

why should they receive imposition of hands, and a new ordination, if they did not receive an ordinary calling? we meane if they were not admitted into ordinary functions by imposition of hands. I answer, This denyall with all whereon it is builded is grosse: For to bring them from a Superiour order to an Inferiour, is to abase them. But the Evangelists office was superiour to Pastors. Ergo. The assumption proved. First, Every office is so much the greater, by how much the power of it is of ampler extent and lesse restrained. But the Evangelists power of teaching and governing was illimitted. Ergo. The assumption proved. Where ever an Apostle did that part of Gods worke which belonged to an Apostle; there an Evangelist might doe that which belonged to him. But that part of Gods worke which belonged to an Apostle he might doe any where without limitation. Ergo. Secondly, every Minister by how much he doth more approximate to the highest, by so much he is higher. But the companions, & coadjutors of the Apostles, were neerer then ordinary Pastors. Ergo. Who are next the King, in his Kingdome, but those who are *Regis Comites*. The Evangelists were *Comites* of these Ecclesiasticall Cheistaines. *Chrysostome* doth expresly say on Ephes. 4. That the Evangelists in an ambulatory course spreading the Gospell, were above any bishop or Pastor which resteth in a certaine Church. Wherefore to make them Presbyters is a weake conceite. For every Prsbyter (properly so called) was constituted in a certaine Church to doe the worke of the Lord in a certaine Church. But Evangelists were not, but to doe the worke of the Lord in any Church as they should be occasioned. Ergo, they were no Presbyters properly so called. Now for their ordination; *Timothy* received none as the Doctor conceiveth, but what hee had from the hand of the Apostle and Presbyters, when now he was taken of *Paul* to be his companion. For no doubt but the Church which gave him a good testimony, did by her Presbyters concurre with *Paul* in his promoting to that office. Obj. What, could they lay on hands with the Apostles, which *Phillip* could not, and could they enter one into an extraordinary office? Answ. They did lay on hands with the Apostles, as it is expresly read, both of the Apostles and them. It is one thing to use precatory imposition, another to use miraculous imposition, such as the Apostles did, whereby the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were conferred. In the first, Presbyters have power. Neither is it certaine, that *Phillip* could not have imposed hands, and given the Holy Ghost. For though he could, he might choose in wisedome for their greater confirmation and edification to let that be done by persons more eminent. Finally, imposition of hands may be used in promoting and setting one forth to an extraordinary office.

For

For every extraordinary office is not attended with immediate vocation from God. As the calling of Evangelists, though extraordinary, was in this unlike the calling of Apostles and Prophets. Secondly, men called immediately may be promoted to the more fruitfull exercise of their immediate and extraordinary callings by imposition of hands from their inferiours, as *Paul* and *Barnabas* were. Howsoever, it is plaine, that *Timothy* by imposition of hands, was ordained to no calling, but the calling of an Evangelist. For that calling he was ordained to, which he is called on by *Paul* to exercise, and fully execute. But he is called on by him to doe the work of an Evangelist. Ergo, that calling he was ordained to.

That worke which exceedeth the calling of an ordinary bishop, was not put upon an ordinary bishop. But *Titus* his worke did so: for it was to plant Presbyters Towne by Towne through a Nation. Ergo. For the ordinary plantation and erecting of Churches to their due frame, exceedeth the calling of an ordinary bishop. But this was *Titus* his worke. Ergo. Bishops are given to particular Churches when now they are framed, that they may keepe them winde and wether tight, they are not to lay foundations, or to exedifie some imperfect beginnings. But say *Titus* had beene a bishop: he is no warrant for ordinary bishops, but for Primates whose authority did reach through whole Ilands. Nay, if the Doctors rule out of *Theodoret* were good, it would serve for a bishop of the pluralitie cut. For it is said he placed Presbyters city by city, or Towne by Towne, who are in name onely bishops, but not that he placed Angels or Apostles in any part of it. He therefore was the sole bishop of them, the rest were but Presbyters, such as had the name, not the office and government of Bishops.

Finally, were it granted that they were ordinary bishops, and written to doe the things that bishops doe, yet would it not be a ground for their majority of power in matter sacramentall and jurisdiction, as is above excepted.

The fifth Argument.

The Ministers which the Church had generally and perpetually the first 300. yeares after Christ and his Apostles, and was not ordained by any generall Councell, were undoubtedly of Apostolicall institution. But the Church ever had Diocesan bishops in singularity of preheminence during life, and in majority of power of ordination and jurisdiction above others, and these not instituted by generall Councells. Ergo, The proposition is plaine both by *Austin de Bapt. contra Donat. lib. 4. & Epist 118.* and by *Tertul. Constat. id ab Apostolis traditum quod apud Ecclesias Apostolorum fuit sacrosanctum.* For who can thinke that all the Churches generally, would conspire to abolish the order of Christ planted by the Apostles, and

ſet up other Miniſters then Chriſt had ordained. The aſſumption is plaine : for if the Church had Metropolitans anciently, and from the beginning, as the Councell of Nice teſtifieth, much more biſhops. For Dioceſan biſhops muſt bee before them, they riſing of combination of Cities and Dioces. And the councell of Epheſus teſtifieth, the government of thoſe biſhops of Cyprus, to have been ever from the beginning, according to the cuſtome of old received. Yea, that the attempt of the biſhop of Antioch, was againſt the Canons of the Apoſtles. Againe, *Cyprian* doth teſtifie, that long before his time, biſhops were placed in all Provinces and Cities, beſides the ſucceſſion of biſhops from the Apoſtles times: for they prove their originall to have beene in the Apoſtles times. Neither were they inſtituted by any generall councell. For long before the firſt generall councell, we read Metropolitans to have beene ordained in the Churches. Yea, *Jerom* himſelfe is of opinion, that no councell of after times, but the Apoſtles themſelves did ordaine biſhops; for even ſince thoſe contentions wherein ſome ſaid, *I am Pauls, others, I am Apollos*, they were ſet up by generall decree : which could not bee made, but by the Apoſtles themſelves. And in *Pſal.* 44. hee maketh *David* to prophecy of biſhops, who ſhould be ſet up as the Apoſtles Succeſſors.

Anſwer.

Firſt, we deny the propoſition. For firſt, this doth preſuppoſe ſuch an aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit with the Church, that ſhe cannot generally take up any cuſtome, or opinion, but what hath Apoſtolicall warrant, whereas the contrary may be ſhewed in many inſtances. Keeping of holy dayes was a generall practiſe through the Churches, before any councell enacted it, yet was no Apoſtolicall tradition. *Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 22. Evangelium non impoſuit hoc, ut dies feſti obſerventur, ſed homines ipſi ſuis quique locis ex more quodam introduxerunt.* Taking the Euchariſt faſting, the faſts on Wedneſday, and Saturday, faſting in ſome faſhion before Eaſter, ceremonies in baptiſing, the government of Metropolitans were generally received before any councell eſtabliſhed.

2. It doth preſuppoſe, that the Church cannot generally conſpire in taking up any cuſtome, if ſhe be not led into it by ſome generall proponent, as a generall repreſentative councell, or the Apoſtles, who were Oecumenicall Doctors, but I ſee no reaſon for ſuch a preſumption.

3. This doth preſuppoſe, that ſomething may be which is of Apoſtlicall authority, which neither directly nor conſequently is included in the word written. For when there are ſome cuſtomes which have beene generall, which yet cannot be grounded in the word written, it is neceſſary by this propoſition, that ſome things

may

may be in the Church having authority Apoſtolicall, as being delivered by word unwritten. For they cannot have warrant from the Apoſtles but by word written or unwritten. To the proofe we anſwer: That of *Tertullian* maketh not to the purpoſe, for hee ſpeaketh of that which was in Churches Apoſtolicall, as they were now planted by them, which the ſentence at large ſet downe will make cleare. *Si conſtat id bonum quod prius, & id prius quod eſt ab initio, ab initio quod ab Apoſtolis, pariter utiq; conſtabit id eſſe ab Apoſtolis traditum quod apud Eccleſias Apoſtolorum ſuam it ſacroſanctum.* Touching *Auſtins* rule we would aske what is the meaning of theſe words, *Non niſi Apoſtolica authoritate traditum rectiſſimè creditur.* If they ſay his meaning is, that ſuch a thing cannot but in their writings be delivered, they doe pervert his meaning, as is apparent by that, *Cont. Don. lib. 2. 27. Conſuetudinem ex Apoſtolorum traditione venientem, ſint multa non inveniuntur in literis eorum, & tamen quia cuſtodiuntur per univerſam Eccleſiam, non niſi ab ipſis tradita & commendata credduntur.* And we wiſh them to ſhew from Scripture what they ſay is contained in it. If they yeeld, he doth meane as he doth of unwritten tradition, we hope they will not juſtifie him in this; we will take that liberty in him, which himſelfe doth in all others, and giveth us good leave to uſe in his owne writings. Now count him in this to favour Traditions, as ſome of the Papiſts do not cauſelesly make this rule the meaſuring cord, which doth take in the latitude of all traditions: yet wee appeale to *Auſtines* judgement otherwhere, who though by this rule hee maketh a univerſall practiſe not begunne by Councells, an argument of Divine and Apoſtolicall authority, yet dealing againſt Donatiſts, Lib. 1. Don. cap. 7. hee ſaith, he will not uſe this argument, becauſe it was but humane and uncertaine, *ne videar humanis argumentis illud probare, ex Evangelio proſero certa documenta.*

Wee anſwer to the aſſumption two things: Firſt, it cannot bee proved, that univerſally there were ſuch Diocesan biſhops as ours. For in the Apoſtles times it cannot be proved, that Churches which they planted were divided into a mother Church, and ſome Parochiall Churches. Now while they governed together in common with Presbyters, and that but one congregation, they could not be like our Diocesan biſhops. And though there bee doubtfull relations, that Rome was divided under *Evariſtus*, yet this was not common through the Church. For *Tripertite* ſtory teſtifieth, that till the time of *Sozomen*, they did in ſome parts continue together. Trip. hiſt. lib. 1. cap. 19. Secondly, thoſe Biſhops which had no more but one Deacon to helpe them in their miniſtery toward their Churches, they could not be Diocesan Biſhops. But ſuch in many parts the Apoſtles planted, as *Epiphanius* doth teſtifie. Ergo.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, ſuch Countries as did uſe to have biſhops in villages and little townes, could not have Dioceſan b ſhops. But ſuch there were after the Apoſtles times in Cyprus and Arabia, as *Sozom.* in his 7. booke, cap. 10 teſtifieth. Ergo, Dioceſan biſhops were never ſo univerſal'y received. Secondly, biſhops came to be common by a Councell, ſaith *Ambroſe*, *Proſpiciente Concilio*. *Amb. in 4. ad Eph.* or by a Decree p ſſing through the world: *toto orbe decretum eſt*, ſaith *Jerom ad Evag.* which is to bee conſidered not of one Oecumeniall Councell, but diſtributively, in that ſingular Churches did in their Presbyteries decree, and that ſo, that one for the moſt part followed another in it. This *interpretative*, though not *formaliter*, is a generall decree. But to thinke this was a decree of *Pauls*, is too too abſurd. For beſides that the Scripture would not have omitted a decree of ſuch importance, as tended to the alteration of and conſummation of the frame of Churches begun through all the world. How could *Ierom* (if this decree were the Apoſtles) conclude that biſhops were above Presbyters *magis conſuetudine Eccleſiæ*, then *Dominicæ diſpoſitionis veritate*. If the Doct. do except, that cuſtome is here put for *Apoſtolicall inſtitution*; let him put in one for the other, and ſee how well it will become the ſenſe. *Let Biſhops know they are greater then Priſts rather by the Decree of the Apoſtle, then by the truth of Chriſts diſpoſition.* Is it not fine, that the Apoſtles ſhould be brought in as oppoſites, facing Chriſt their Lord? And this concluſion of *Ierom* doth make me th nke that *decretum eſt* imported no more, then that it was tooke up in time for cuſtome through the world. Which is elegantly ſaid to be a decree, becauſe cuſtome groweth in time to obtaine *vim legis*, the force of a decree. But *Amb eſe* his place is plain, *Proſpiciente Concilio*, he meant th not a councell held by Apoſtles. For he maketh this proviſion by councell to have come in when now in Egypt & Alexandria, Presbyters according to the cuſtome of that Church, were not found fit to ſucceed each other, but they choſe out of their presbyteries men of beſt deſert. Now to *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius*, there were a ſucceſſion of Prest yters in the Church of Alexandria, as *Euſebius* and *Ierom* both affirme. Wherefore briefly, ſeeing no ſuch univerſall cuſtome can be proved, all the godly fathers never conſpired to aboliſh Chriſts inſtitution. Secondly, could a cuſtome have prevailed with all of them, whom we have to *Conſtantines* time, yet it might enter and ſteale upon them through humane frailty, as theſe errours in doctrine did upon many otherwiſe godly and faithfull Martyrs: the rather becauſe the alteration was ſo little at the firſt and Ariſtocraticall government was ſtill continued. Thirdly, ſay, they had wittingly and wittingly done it through the world, they had not conſpired, becauſe they might have deemed ſuch power in the Church, and themſelves to doe nothing but what they might with

with Christs good liking for the edification of it. How many of the chiefe Patrons of this cause, are at this day of this judgement, that if it were but an Apostolicall institution, as Apostolicall is contradistinguished to divine, they might change it. But if the Apostles did enact this order, as Legats and Embassadours of Christ, then is it not theirs, but Christs owne institution. What an Embassadour speaketh as an Embassadour, it is principally from him that sent him: but if they who were Legates, did not, bearing the person of Legats, but of ordinary Ecclesiasticall governours, decree this; then it is certaine, Church governours may alter it without treasonable conspiring against Christ.

As for those proofes, that Bishops have beene throughout all Churches from the beginning they are weake. For first, the Councell of Nice useth ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, not *simpliciter*, but *secundum quid*, in order happly to that time wherein the custome began, which was better knowne to them then to us: the phrase is so used, Act. 15. 8. in respect of some things which had not continued many yeares. They cannot meane the Apostles times, for then Metropolitans should have actually beene from the Apostles time. Secondly, the phrase of the Councell of Ephesus, is likewise æquivocall; for they have reference to the fathers of Nice, or at least the decrees of the fathers, who went before the Councell of Nice. For those words being added, *definitionis Nicenæ fidei*, seeme to explaine the former, *Canones Apostolorum*. It is plaine the decree of the Councell doth ascribe this thing onely to ancient custome, no lesse then that of Nice, Constantinople and Chalcedon; and therefore cannot rise to the authority of sacred Scriptures. Let him shew in all antiquity where sacred Scriptures are called Canons of the Apostles. Finally, if this phrase note rules given by the Apostles, then the Apostles themselves did set out the bounds of Cyprus and Antioch. As for the authority of *Cyprian*, he doth testifie what was *Communiter* in his time, Bishops ordained in cities; not *universaliter*, as if there were no city but had some. Secondly, hee speaketh of Bishops who had their Churches included in Cities, not more then might meet together in one, to any common deliberations. They had no Diocesan Churches, nor were bishops who had majority of rule over their Presbyters, nor sole power of ordination. As for the Catalogue of succession, it is *pompæ aptior quam pugnæ*; Rome can recite their successors. But because it hath had Bishops. Ergo, Oecumenicall bishops is no consequence. All who are named bishops in the Catalogue, were not of one cut, and in that sense we controvert.

Touching that which doth improve their being constituted by any Councell, it is very weake. For though wee read of no generall

Councell, yet there might be, and the report not come to us. Secondly, we have shewed, that the Councell of Nice doth not prove this that bishops were every where from the beginning; the phrase of from the beginning, being there respectively, not absolutely used. Neither doth *Jerom* ever contrary this: for hee doth not use those words in propriety, but by way of allusion; otherwise if hee did think the Apostle had published this decree, when the first to the Corinths was written, how can he cite testimonies long after written, to prove that Bishops were not instituted in the Apostles time, but that they were ordained by the Church *jure Ecclesiastico*, when the time served for it.

The sixt Argument.

Such as even at this day are in the reformed Churches, such Ministers are of Christs institution. But Ministers having singularitie of preheminence and power above others, are amongst them, as the Superintendents in Germany. Ergo. *Answ.* The assumption is utterly denied. For Superintendents in Germany are nothing like our Bishops: they are of the same degree with other Ministers, they are onely Presidents while the Synod lasteth; when it is dissolved, their prerogative ceaseth: they have no prerogative over their fellow Ministers; they are subject to the Presbyteries, Zepp. lib. 2 cap. 20. pag. 324. The Synod ended, they returne to the care of their particular Churches.

The seventh Argument.

If it were necessary that while the Apostles lived, there should bee such Ministers as had preheminence and majority of power above others, much more after their departure. But they thought it necessary, and therefore appointed *Timothy* and *Titus*, and other Apostolicke men furnished with such power. Ergo, much more after their departure. *Answ.* The assumption is denyed, and formerly disproved: for they appointed no such Apostolicke men with Episcopall power, in which they should be succeeded.

The eighth Argument.

Such Ministers as were in the Apostles times not contradicted by them, were lawfull. For they would not have held their peace, had they knowne unlawfull Ministers to have crept into the Churches.

But there were before *Johns* death in many Churches a succession of Diocesan Bishops, as in Rome, *Linus*, *Clement*, at Jerusalem *James Simeon*, at Antioch, *Evodius*, at Alexandria, S. *Mark*, *Anianus*, *Abilius*. Ergo, Diocesan Bishops be lawfull.

Answer. The assumption is denyed: for these Bishops were but

Presi-

Presbyters, Pastors of one congregation ordinarily meeting, governing with common consent of their Presbyteries. If they were affecting our bishops majority, they were in *Diotrephes* sufficiently contradicted.

The ninth Argument.

Those who have beene ever held of a higher order then Presbyters, they are before Presbyters in preheminence, and majority of rule. But bishops have beene held in a higher order by all antiquity. Ergo. The assumption is manifest: In the Councell of Nice, Ancyra, Sardica, Antioch, Ministers are distinguished into three orders. *Ignatius*, *Clemens* in his Epistle to *James*, *Dionys. Areopag. de Cœlest. Hierom. cap. 5. Tertull. de fuga in persecutione*, & *de Baptismo*. *Ignatius* doth often testifie it. No wonder, when the Scripture it selfe doth call one of these a step to another, 1 Timoth. 3. 13. Cyprian. Lib. 4. Ep. 2. Counc. Ephes. Cap. 1. 2. 6. Yea the Councell of Chalcedon counteth it sacriledge, to reduce a Bishop to the degree of a Presbyter. This *Hierome* himselfe confirmeth, saying: That from *Marke* to *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*, the Presbyters did set a bishop over them in higher degree.

Answer.

The Proposition is not true in regard of majority of rule. For no Apostle had such power over the meanest Deacon in any of the Churches. But to the Assumption we answer by distinction.

An order is reputed higher, either because intrinsecally it hath a higher vertue, or because it hath a higher degree of dignity and honour. Now wee deny that ever antiquity did take the bishop above his Presbyters to be in a higher order then a Presbyter, further then a higher order doth signifie an order of higher dignity and honor, τάξις or βαθμὸς μείζους τιμῆς, as the Councell of Sardica speaketh. Which is further proved: because the fathers did not hold a bishop to differ from a Presbyter, as Presbyter from a Deacon. For these differ *genere proximo*; *Noverint Diaconi se ad ministerium non ad sacerdotum vocari*. But a bishop differeth from a Presbyter, as from one who hath the power of Priesthood no lesse then himselfe, and therefore the difference betwixt these, must be circumstantially, not so essentiall as betwixt the other. Thus bishops and Archbishops are divers orders of bishops, not that one exceedeth the other, as a power of higher vertue, but of higher dignity then then the other. More plainely; There may be a fourefold difference *in gradu*. 1. *in potestate gradus*. 2. *in Exercito*. 3. *in Dignitate*. 4. *in amplitudine Iurisdictionis*. The first difference is not betweene a bishop and a Presbyter, according

cording to the common tenent of antiquity, or the Schoole, but only is maintained by ſuch as hold the Character of a Prieſt and Biſhop inwardly, diverſe one from the other. For as a biſhop differeth not in power and degree from an Archbiſhop, becauſe nothing an Archbiſhop can doe, as confirming, conſecrating Biſhops, &c. but a biſhop can doe alſo. So neither doth a Presbyter from a biſhop. *Obiect.* But the Prieſt cannot ordaine a Presbyter, and conſirme as the biſhop doth, and therefore differeth. *Poteſtate gradus.* To this I anſwer, that theſe authours meane not this difference in power (*de fundamentali & remota poteſtate, ad ampliata, immediata, & iam actu horum effectuum productiva*) as if Presbyters had not a remote and fundamentall power to doe thoſe things: but that they have not, before they be ordained biſhops, their power ſo enlarged, as to produce theſe effects actually. As a boy hath a generative faculty while he is a child, which he hath when he is a man, but yet it is not in a child free from all impediment, that it can actually beget the like. But this is too much to grant. For the power ſacramentall in the Prieſt, is an actuall power which hee is able to performe and execute, nothing defective in regard of them, further then they be with-held from the exerciſe of it. For that cauſe which ſtandeth in compleat actuality to greater & more noble effects, hath an inferior & leſſer of the ſame kind under it alſo, unleſſe the application of the matter be intercepted. Thus a Presbyter he hath a ſacramentall power ſtanding in full actuality to higher ſacramentall actions, & therfore cannot but have theſe inferior of confirmation and orders in his power, further then they are excepted & kept from being applied to him. And therefore power ſacramentall cannot be in a Presbyter, as the generative faculty is in a child, for this is inchoate onely, and imperfect, ſuch as cannot produce that effect. The power of the Prieſt is compleat. Secondly, I ſay, theſe are no ſacramentall actions. Thirdly, were they, yet as much may be ſaid to prove an Archbiſhop a diſtinct order from a biſhop, as to prove a Presbyter and biſhop differing in order. For it is proper to him out of power to generate a biſhop, other biſhops laying on hands, no otherwiſe then Presbyters are ſaid to doe, where they joine with their biſhops. If that rule ſtand not *major ad minori*, nor yet *equalis ab equali*, I marvel how biſhops can beget biſhops equall, yea ſuperior to them, as in conſecrating the Lord Archbiſhop, & yet a Presbyter may not ordaine a Presbyter. It doth not ſtand with their Epiſcopall majority, that the rule (*every one may give that which he hath*) ſhould hold here in the exerciſe of their power. Thoſe who are in one order may differ *jure divino* or *humano*. Aaron differed from the Prieſts not in power ſacramentall, for they might all offer incenſe, and make interceſſion. But the ſolemne interceſſion in the holy of holies

God

God did except and appropriate to the high Priest the type of Christ. Priests would have reached to this power of intercession in the holy place, or any act of like kinde: but that God did not permit that this should come under them, or they intermeddle in it. Thus by humane law the bishop is greater in exercise then the Priest. For though God hath not excepted any thing from the one free to the other, yet commonly confirmation, ordination, absolution by imposing hands in receiving Penitents, consecrating Churches and Virgines, have beene referred to the bishop for the honor of Priesthood, rather then any necessity of law, as *Jerom* speaketh. Finally, in dignity, those may differ many waies, who in degree are equall, which is granted by our adversaries in this cause. Yea, they say in amplitude of jurisdiction, as in which it is apparant an Archbishop exceedeth an other. But were it manifest that God did give bishops Pastorall power through their Diocesse, and an Archbishop through his Province, though but when hee visiteth, this would make one differ in order from the other; as in this regard Evangelists differed from ordinary Pastors. But that jurisdiction is in one more then another, is not established, nor hath apparency in any Scripture.

To the proofes thereof I answer briefly: the one may be a step to the other, while they differ in degrees of dignities, though essentially they are but one and the same order. In this regard it may be sacrilege to reduce one, from the greater to the lesser, if he have not deserved it. As for that of *Jerom* it is most plaine, hee did meane no further order, but onely in respect of some dignities wherewith they invested their bishop, or first Presbyter, as that they did mount him up in a higher seat, the rest sitting lower about him, and gave him this preheminence to sit first as a Consull in the Senate, and moderate the carriage of things amongst them: this *Celsiori gradu*, being nothing but his honourable ἀξίωσις, not importing sole authority. For by a Canon of Councell of Laodicea, wee finde that the bishop had this priviledge to sit first, though Presbyters did together with him enter, and sit as Judges of equall commission. For though Deacons stood, Presbyters did alwaies sit *in circuitu Episcopi*.

10. *Argument.*

If bishops be that which *Aaron*, and the Apostles were, and Presbyters, be that which the Priests, and the 72. Disciples were, then the one are above the other in preheminence and power. But they are so. See *Jerom* to *Nepotian*. Ergo.

Answer.

If bishops, &c. and Presbyters, be that which the sonnes of *Aaron* and the 72. were, then there are different orders, &c. To these

may be added a third. That which *Moses* and the 70. Seniors were, that are the bishops and Presbyters. First, for the proposition it is not true, for first of *Aaron* and his sonnes, they were not orders different essenally in their power, but onely in degree of dignity, wherein the high Priest was above others. For every Priests power would have reached to that act which was reserved to the high Priest onely. Besides, when the high Priest was deceased or removed, the other Priests did consecrate the successour, as *Sadock*. Finally, the one had for substance the same consecration that the other, neither had the high Priest any majority of directive or corrective power over others. So the Apostles, and 72. will not be found different in order; and therefore those who resemble these cannot be concluded to be of divers orders. For the Apostles and 72. differ no more then ordinary messengers who are imployed in a set course, and extraordinary sent by occasion onely: They were both messengers, the Apostles *habitu* and abidingly, the other in act onely, and after a transitory manner.

Againe, had *Aaron* and his sonnes beene divers orders, differing essentially in the inward power of them, yet is not the proposition true, but with addition in this wise. Those who are indentically and formally that which *Aaron* and the Apostles were, and that which his sonnes, and the 72. were, they differ in degree essentially, not those who were this analogically by reason of some imperfect resemblance. For things may be said to be those things wherewith they have but imperfect similitude. In this sense onely the proposition is true.

Now to come to the assumption. First, touching *Aaron*, wee deny any bishop is as *Aaron* by divine institution, or by perfect similitude answering to him. But because *Aaron* was the first and high Priest, others inferiour: so it hath pleased the Church to imitate this pollicy, and make the bishop, as it were *Primum Presbyterum* or *Antistuem in primo ordine*, Presbyters *in secundo*. Whence Bishops may be said to be that which *Aaron* was through the Churches ordination, which she framed, looking to this patterne of government which God himselfe had set out in the old Testament. The fathers call them *Aaron* and his sonnes onely for some common analogy, which through the ordinance of the Church arose betwixt the bishops and Presbyters, and them; and conceive them to be so by humane accommodation, not by divine institution. But that they were so properly succeeding them as orders of Ministery typified by them by Gods owne appointment, this the fathers never thought. Christs priesthood, no mans, was properly typified in *Aaron*.

So

So touching the other part of the assumption, That Bishops and Presbyters are what Apostles, and the 72 were. The fathers many of them insist in this proportion, that as the Apostles and 72 were teachers, the one in a higher, the other in an inferiour order, so bishops and Presbyters, were by the Churches ordinance. This is the fathers phrase, to call them Apostles, who in any manner resemble the Apostles to call them, as *Ambrose*. Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, Doctors, who resemble these, and come in some common analogie neerest them, *Moses* and the 70 Seniors, who in any sort resembled them. Now the assumption granted in this sense maketh not against us. For they might be said these, if there were but diverse degrees of dignity amongst them, though for power of order by Gods institution they were all one. But some straine it further, and take it, that Christ instituting those two orders, did in so doing, institute Bishops and Presbyters, the one whereof succeeded the Apostles, the other the 72. and that thus the Fathers take it. To which I answer, First, in generall, this analogy of Apostles and 72: is not generally affected by them all. *Ignatius ad Smyrnenses dicit Apostolis Presbyteros successisse, Diaconos 72. discipulis. Clem. lib. 2. Const. cap.* 30. saith, That Bishops answer to God the Father, Presbyters to Christ, Deacons to the Apostles. *Ierom* doth manifestly make Presbyters (whom hee also calleth by name of Bishops in that Epistle, where hee maintaineth the Presbyters dignity) successours to the Apostles. The like hath *Cyprian*, *Apostolus id est Episcopos & præpositos*, that is, *ordinis ratione præpositos minorum Ecclesiarum*, as *Austin* speaketh, else it should bee all one with the former; when hee maketh the Presbyter as well as the Bishop to bee ordained in the Apostles. Finally, these Fathers who take the 72. to have beene Apostles, as well as the other, could not imagine this porportion of diverse orders set up in them. Secondly, if Christ in these instituted those other, it must bee one of these waies. First, hee did make these not onely Apostles, but Bishops, and so the 72. not onely his messengers for the time, but Presbyters also. Or, secondly, else hee did ordaine these as he did raine Manna, noting and prefiguring as by a type, a further thing which hee would worke: viz. that he would institute Bishops and Presbyters for Teachers ordinary in his Church: but both these are *gratis* spoken without any foundation or reason. For the first, wee have shewed that the Apostles could not bee Bishops ordinarily; nor yet the calling of these seventy two (which was to goe through all Cities Evangelizing) stand with Presbyters, Presbyters being given to Churches κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, and there fixed. Neither can the latter be true: for then

then Christ should have given a Sacrament, when he ordained his Apostles, and sent forth his 72. Secondly, the type or the shadow is lesse then the thing typified, the substance of it. But the giving Apostles was a greater thing then giving ordinary Pastors. Ergo. Thirdly, I say, that Christ did never ordaine that any should succeed the Apostles, or the 72. in regard of their order. There is a double succession, *in gradum*, or *in Caput*, as the jurists distinguish. *In gradum eundem*, as when one brother dying, another brother doth succeed him in the inheritance. *In Caput*, as when one not of the same degree and line doth come after another, as when a brother dying another doth inherit after him, not a brother, but a cosin to him. Thus the Apostles have no successors succeeding them *in gradum*, but such onely as follow them, being of other degrees, and in another line, as it were, in which sort every Pastor doth succeed them. But then they are said to succeed them, because they follow them, and after a sort resemble them, not because they hold the places which the Apostles did properly. *Apostolo in quantum est Apostolus non succeditur, Legato quatenus est Legatus non succeditur.* Fourthly, that the Presbyters doe as persons of a diverse order succeed the Apostles no lesse fully then any other. First, they must needs succeed them who are spoken to in them, whose duties are laid downe in that which the Apostles received in commandement. But the Presbyters were spoken to both in the Keyes, in the Supper, in the commandement of teaching and baptizing. Ergo, Presbyters must needs succeed the Apostles. Secondly, those whom the Apostles did institute in the Churches, which they had planted for their further building them up, they were their next successors. But the Apostles did commend the Churches to the care of Presbyters who might build them up, whom they had now converted. Ergo, these were their successors most proper and immediate. Thirdly, these to whom now taking their farewells they resigned the Churches, these were their successours. But this they did to Presbyters, *Paul* now never to see Ephesus more, *Act.* 20. *Peter* neere death, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. Ergo. Fourthly, if one Pastor or Minister doe more properly resemble an Apostle then another, it is because hee hath some power Apostolique more fully conveyed to him then to another. But this was not done. Ergo. The assumption is manifest: for first, their power of teaching and ministring the Sacraments doth as fully and properly belong to the Presbyter as to any, unlesse we count Preaching not necessarily connexed to a Presbyters office, but a bishops; or at least that a more rudimentall preaching belongs to a Presbyter, the more full and exact teaching being appropriate to the Bishop, which are both too absurd. Secondly, for governement, the Apostles did no more give the power of governement to

one

one then to another. *Obiect.* This is denyed, for the Apoſtles are ſaid to have kept the power of ordination, and the coercive power in their owne hands, and to have committed theſe in the end onely to Apoſtolike men, as *Timothy*, *Titus*, who were their ſucceſſours, ſucceeding them in it. *Anſw.* A notable fiction: for it is moſt plaine by Scripture; that ordination, power of deciding controverſies, excommunication, were given to Presbyters, and not kept up from them; they ſhould otherwiſe have provided ill for the Churches which they left to their care. Secondly, if the Apoſtles did commit ſome ordinary power of government to ſome men above others, in which regard they ſhould be their ſucceſſours, then the Apoſtles did not onely enjoy as *Legates* power over the Churches, but as ordinary Miniſters. For what power they enjoyed as *Legates*, this they could not *alijs Legare*. Power as ordinary Paſtors in any Nations or Churches they never reſerved, and therefore did never ſubſtitute others to themſelves in that which they never exerciſed nor enjoyed. And it is to be noted, that this opinion of Epiſcopall ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles is grounded on this, that the Apoſtles were not onely Apoſtles, but Biſhops in Provinces and particular Churches. For the Papiſts themſelves urged with this, that the Apoſtles have none ſucceeding them, they doe conſider a double reſpect in the Apoſtles, the one of *Legates*, ſo *Petur*, nor any other could have a ſucceſſour. The other of biſhops, *Oecumenicall* in *Peter*, of Biſhops Nationall or Dioceſan, as in ſome other. Thus onely conſidered, they grant them to have other Biſhops ſucceeding them: For the Apoſtolick power preciſely conſidered, was *Privilegium perſonale ſimul cum perſona extinctum*. Now we have proved that this ground is falſe, and therefore that ſucceeding the Apoſtles, more appropriate to Biſhops then other Miniſters grounded upon it, is falſe alſo.

Laſtly, the Presbyters cannot be ſaid ſucceſſors of the ſeventy two. For firſt, in all that is ſpoken to the ſeventy two, the full duty and office of a Presbyter is not laid downe. Secondly, it doth not appeare that they had any ordinary power of preaching or baptizing and miniſtering the other Sacrament. For they are ſent to Evangelize, to preach the Goſpell: but whether from power of ordinary office, or from commiſſion and delegation onely for this preſent occaſion it is doubtfull. Thirdly, it is not read that they ever baptized, or had the power of adminiſtring the Supper given to them: Yea, that they had neither miniſtery of Word or Sacraments *ex officio ordinario*, ſeemeth hence plaine; That the Apoſtles did chooſe them to the Deacons care, which was ſo cumberſome that themſelves could not tend the miniſtery of the Word with it, much leſſe then could theſe not having ſuch extraordinary gifts as the Apoſtles had. Fourthly, if they were ſet Miniſters, then were they Evangeliſts in deſtination. For the act

enjoyned them, is from City to City, without limitation to Evangelize; and after we read of some, as *Philip*, that he was an Evangelist; the same is in ecclesiasticall story testified of some others. Thus we Presbyters should succeed Evangelists those Apostolique men, whom the Apostles constituted Bishops, and by consequence be the true successours of the Apostles. These Evangelists succeeded them by all grant, we succeed these. Finally, *Armachanus* doth take these 72. to have been ordinary disciples, in his 7. *Book Armenicarum quæst. cap.* 7.

11 *Argument.*

Those who receive a new ordination are in a higher degree in a new administration, and a new order. But Bishops doe so. Ergo.

Answer.

The proposition is denyed: for it is sufficient to a new ordination that they are called to exercise the Pastorall function in a new Church, where before they had nothing to doe. Secondly, I answer by distinction, a new order, by reason of new degrees of dignity, this may be granted: but that therefore it is a new order, that is, having further ministeriall power *in* regard of the Sacraments and jurisdiction given it of God, is not true. Hath not an Archbishop a distinct ordination or consecration from a Bishop? yet is he not of any order essentially differing. The truth is, ordination, if it be looked into, is but a canonicall solemnity which doth not collate that power Episcopall to the now chosen, but onely more solemnly and orderly promotes him to the exercise of it.

12 *Argument.*

Those Ministers whereof there may be but one onely during life in a Church, they are in singularity of preheminence above others. But there may be but one Bishop, though there may be many other Presbyters, one *Timothy*, one *Titus*, one *Archippus*, one *Epaphroditus*. Ergo. For proofe of the assumption. See *Cornelius*, as *Eusebius* relateth his sentence, *lib.* 6. *cap.* 43. *Conc Nice. cap* 8. *Conc. Calced. cap* 4. *Possidonius in vita Augustine. Ierom. Phil.* 1. *ver.* 1. *Chrysost. Amb. Theod. Oecument.* And such was Bishops preheminence, that Presbyters, Deacons, and other Clerkes, are said to be the Bishops Clerks.

Answer.

I answer to the Assumption. That there may be said to be but one Bishop in order to other Coadjutors and Associates within the same Church. It may be said, there must be but one Bishop in order to all the other Churches of the Cities. Secondly, this may be affirmed as standing by Canon, or as divine institution. Now the assumption is true, onely by Law Ecclesiasticall. For the Scripture is said to have placed Presbyters who did *Superintendere*, *Acts* 20. and

that

that there were Bishops at *Philippi*. True it is, the Scripture doth not distinguish how many of the one sort, nor how many of the other, because no doubt for the number of the Congregations, a single Presbyter labouring in the Word, or two, the one coadjutor to the other might be placed. Secondly, it is testified by *Epiphanius*, that ordinarily all Cities but *Alexandria* had two. Thirdly, *Ierom* on 1 Tim. 3. doth say, that now indeed there may be but one Bishop, meaning Canonically, making a difference twixt the present time and time Apostolique. Fourthly, *Austin* did not know it was unlawfull: Yea, he did onely in regard of the decree of Nice, account it so. *Ep* 110. neither did Church or people ever except against the contrary, but as a point against Canon, which might in some cases be dispensed with, as the story of *Narcissus*, and *Alexander*, and *Liberius*, and *Felix* did more then manifest. For though the people of Rome cried out, one God, one Christ, one Bishop, yet they yeelded at their Emperours suite, whereas had it beene a thing they had all thought to have been against Christs institution, they would not have done. *Vide Soz. lib. 4. cap.* 14. Fiftly, *Ierom's* peereleſſe power, is nothing but Consul-like presidence above others; for this he pleaded for, writing against *Iovinian*, *lib.* 1. amongst the Apostles themselves, that schisme might be avoided. Wherefore we yeeld the conclusion in this sense, that the Bishop *jure humano*, hath a singularity of preheminence before others, as by Ecclesiasticall law there might be but one onely Archbishop.

13 *Argument.*

Those who had peereleſſe power above others in ordination and jurisdiction, they were such as had preheminence and majority of rule over others. But the former is due to Bishops. Unleſſe this singularity of power were yeelded, there would be as many schismes as Priests. Ergo. The assumption proved. *Those who have a peculiar power of ordination above others, they are in preheminence and power before others. But Bishops have, Ergo*, they are in, &c. The assumption proved. That which was not in the Presbyters of *Ephesus* and *Crete* before *Timothy* and *Titus* were sent, but in the Apostles, and after in *Timothy* and *Titus* and their successours, that is a peculiar of Bishops. But ordination was not in the Presbyters, &c. Ergo. The assumption proved. That which these were sent to doe, Presbyters had not power to doe. It was therefore in them, and such as succeeded them, the Bishops of Ephesus and Crete. Againe, the Scriptures, Councels, Fathers, speake of the ordeynor as one. Ergo, it was the peculiar right of the Bishop, and the Bishop onely. He onely by Canon was punishible for irregularity in ordination. And *Epiphanius* maketh this the proper power of a Bishop to beget fathers by ordination, as the

Presbyters doth sonnes by baptisme. And *Jerom* doth except ordination as the bishops peculiar, wherein he is most unequall to them.

Answer.

I answer the proposition of the first syllogisme by distinction. Those who have peereleſſe power in regard of the simple right to ordeine: viz. in regard of exercising the act, and sole performing the rite of it, those who have a right to these things originally from Christ and his Apostles, which no others have, they are above others in degree. Againe, peereleſſe power in a bishop over Presbyters may be said in comparison to them distributively or collectively considered. He that hath peereleſſe power given him, which no one of the other hath, is not presently of a greater degree, nor hath not majority of rule amongst others, as a Consul in the Senate: but if he have a peereleſſe power, such as they all collectively considered, cannot controule, then the Proposition is true; but the Assumption will then be found to halt.

To the proofe of the assumption. The Proposition is true of power in order to the thing it selfe, not to ministring the rite, and executing the act, which may be reserved for honour sake to one, by those who otherwise have equall power with him. That bishops have this power in order, the thing it selfe agreeing to them, *Ex proprii officii*, not by commission from others, we deny. The assumption is wholly denyed. As for the proofe of it. First, we that deny that Evangelists had not power to ordeine, as well as Apostles. Secondly, that Presbyters had not this power in a Church planted as well as they. Every one as fellow servants might conspire in the same ordination. The Evangelists power did not derogate from the Apostles, the Presbyters from neither of them. But power of imposing hands solitarily, whereas yet Churches were not constituted, this may happily be appropriated to the Apostles and Evangelists, whose office it was to labour in erecting the frame of Churches. Secondly, the assumption is false; in denying that it was in the power of Presbyters to lay on hands, contrary to that in *Timothy*; *The grace given thee by laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*. Thirdly, it is false, in presupposing others then Presbyters to have beene *Timothy* and *Titus* their successours. To the proofe of this assumption. The proposition is not true: For it might be convenient that the same thing should be done by Evangelists, and by ordinary Pastors, each concurring in their severall orders to the same service of Christ the Lord. Secondly, I answer to the assumption. That Presbyters were to be placed in Churches framed where there were Presbyters, or where there were as yet none. In the

first

firſt Churches, they are bid ordaine, if any need further, but *ſalvo jure Eccleſiæ*, not without the concurrence of others. In the latter Churches which were to be conſtituted, they may be conceived as Evangeliſts, with ſole power of ſeting Presbyters forth by this rite of impoſition of hands. We hold Apoſtles might doe it, Evangeliſts might, and the Presbyteries alſo. Yea, Presbyters in Alexandria when now their firſt Presbyter was deceaſed, did ordaine the following: For the Canon of three biſhops, and Metropolitans, added by the Nicene Councell, was not knowne yet. Nevertheleſſe it grew timely to be reſtrained to biſhops, the performing I meane of the outward rite and ſigne; but onely by Canon, as Conſignation was alſo, for which there is as ancient teſtimonies as this, that it was appropriate to the Biſh. We grant therefore that antiquity doth ſometime ſpeake of the ordainer as one. In the Churches of Affrica one did not lay on hands, yet in ſome other Churches the rite was by one adminiſtred. And it is to be noted by the way, that εἰς ἐπίσκοπον & in ſome Canons is not oppoſed to the Coordaining of Presbyters, but to the number of *Three*, or many biſhops required in the ordination of a biſhop. They might therefore by their Canons be puniſhable, becauſe regularly and canonically the executing of it was committed to them. This is all that *Epiphanius* or *Ierom excepta ordinatione* can prove. But theſe two concluſions we would ſee proved out of Scriptures and Fathers. Firſt, that ordination is an action of power, of order, a power ſacramentall, which a Presbyter hath not. Secondly, that by vertue of this power, the biſhop doth ordaine, and not by Eccleſiaſticall right or commiſſion from the Church. Certainly, the act of promoting a miniſter of the Church, is rather an act of juriſdiction then order. As it belongeth to policy and government, to call new Magiſtrates, where they are wanting. *Object.* But a new ſpirituall officer may be inſtituted by a ſacrament. *Anſw.* If God would ſo have collated the grace of ſpirituall callings; but he hath appointed no ſuch thing. The Apoſtles and 72. were not inſtituted by a ſacrament or impoſition of Chriſts hands. Now the greater the grace was which was given, the more need of a ſacrament whereby it ſhould be given. *Object.* They were extraordinary. *Anſw.* They might have had ſome ambulatory ſacrament for the time. Againe, impoſition of hands was uſed in giving extraordinary graces; Acts 8. Secondly, were it a ſacrament, it ſhould conferre the grace of office, as well as grace ſanctifying the perſon to uſe it holily. But we ſee that this it could not do. As for *Paul* and *Barnabas* the Church did ſeparate them at the command of God, and lay hands on them, and pray for them, but they were already before this, immediately choſen by God to the grace of their office. It could be nothing then but a geſture accompanied with prayer, ſeeking

grace

grace in their behalfe. For the ſacramentall collating of grace ſanctifying all callings, we have in theſe two ſacraments of Chriſts inſtitution. Thirdly, there are many kindes of impoſition of hands in the old and new Teſtament, yet cannot it be proved, that it is any where a proper ſacrament. It is then a rite, a geſture, a ceremony, ſignifying a thing or perſon ſeparate, preſented to God, prayed for to God. Thus Antiquity did thinke of it, as a geſture of one, by prayer to God, ſeeking a bleſſing on every one choſen to this or that place of miniſtery. So Eccleſiaſtically it was uſed in baptiſing, in conſecrating, in reconciling penitents, as well as ordaining: but never granted as a ſacrament in thoſe other caſes by grant of all. It is then a rite or geſture of one, praying. *Tertul. de bapt.* ſheweth this ſaying, *Manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans & invitans ſpiritum ſanctum.* *Ierom* alſo *contra Luciferanos, Non abnuo, hanc eſſe Eccleſiæ conſuetudinem ut Epiſcopus manum impoſiturus excurrat ad invocationem ſpiritus ſancti.* *Ambr. de dign. ſacerdot.* *Sacerdos imponit ſuppicem dexteram.* *Auguſt.* *Quid aliud eſt manus impoſitio quam oratio? &c.* The Greeke Churches have ever given Orders by a forme of prayer conceived with impoſition of hands. Hence it is, that they impoſed hands even on Deaconeſſes, where it could not be otherwiſe conſidered then a deprecative-geſture. Neither is it like the African Fathers ever thought it a ſacrament, which no other had vertue and power to miniſter, but the Biſhop. For then they would never have admitted Presbyters to uſe the ſame rite with them. For ſo they had ſuffered them to prophane a ſacrament, wherein they had no power to intermeddle. *Obiect.* If one ſay they did lay on hands with them, but the Biſhops impoſition was properly *Conſecrative* and ſacramentall, theirs *Deprecative* onely. *Anſwer.* Beſides that this is ſpoken without foundation, how abſurd is it, that the very ſelfeſame ſacramentall rite ſhould be a ſacrament in one miniſters hand, and no ſacrament performed by another: Yea, when the Biſhop doth it to a Presbyter, or Deacon, then a ſacrament; when to a Subdeacon, and other inferiour officers, then none, let any judge. *Auſtin* did account no other of impoſition of hands, then a prayer over a man, accompanied with that geſture. Secondly, they doe not thinke that the Biſhop ordaineth by divine right, it being excepted to him as a miniſter of higher ſacramentall power: but that he onely doth ordaine *quoad ſignum & ritum extrinſecum*, by the Churches commiſſion, though the right of ordaining be in all the Presbytery alſo. As in a Colledge the ſociety have right to chooſe a fellow, and to ordaine him alſo, though the maſter doth alone lay on hands, and give admiſſion. Thus *Ierom* ſpeaketh of confirmation, that it was reſerved to the Biſhop for honour ſake,

rather

rather then any necessity of Gods law. Whence by analogie and proportion, it followeth they thinke not ordination, or those other Episcopall royalties to have beene reserved to him by divine right. Beside, there are more ancient proofes for Canonicall appropriating confirmation, then for this imposition of hands. *Cornelius* speaketh thus of *Novatus*, he wanted those things which he should have had after Baptisme, according to the Canon, the sealing of our Lord from a Bishop, *Euseb. Lib 6. cap. 25.* So *Cyprian* to *Iul.* Nevertheless, *Ierom* judgeth this also to have beene yeelded them for honour sake. And we know that in the Bishops absence, Presbyters through the East did *Consignate*, through Grecia, through Armenia. Neither would *Gregory* the great have allowed Presbyters in the Greeke Churches to have confirmed, had he judged it otherwise then Canonically to belong to the bishops. That therefore which is not properly a sacramentall action, and that which is not appropriate to a bishop further then Presbyters have committed it to him, that cannot make him in higher degree of ministery then Presbyters are.

Thirdly, in reconciling penitents; the Presbyters did it in case of the bishops absence: as is to be gathered from the third Councell of Carthage, 32. And who thinkes blessing so appropriate to a bishop, that Presbyters may not solemnly blesse in the name of the Lord, though antiquity reserved this to him. These therefore were kept to him, not as acts exceeding the Presbyters power of order, but for the supposed honour of him and the Church. For as *Ambrose* saith, *Vt omnes eadem possint irrationale, & vulgarius vilisq; videretur.* It pleaseth antiquity therefore to set up one who should *quoad exercitium* doe many things alone, not because that Presbyters could not, but it seemed in their eyes more to the honor of the Church, that some one should be interessed in them.

Fourthly, *Amalarius* in a certaine booke of sacred orders, doth confute the doctrine of an uncertain author, who taught that one bishop onely was to lay hands on a Deacon: because he was consecrated not to Priesthood, but to ministery and service. *Nunquid scriptor libelli doctior & sanctior Apostolis qui posuerunt plures manus super Diaconos quando consecrabantur, & propterea solus Episcopus manus ponat super Diaconum, ac si solus posset precari virtutem gratiarum quam plures Apostoli precabantur. Optimum est bonos duces sequi, qui certaverunt usq; ad plenam victoriam.* Whence it is plaine, he did know no further thing in imposition then prayer, which the more imposed, is the more forcible.

The fourteenth Argument.

These who had jurisdiction over Presbyters assisting them, and Presbyters affixed to Cures, they had a superiority of power over other ministers. But bishops had so, Ergo, &c.

The

The Assumption is manifest. *Ignatius* describeth the Bishop from this, that he should be the governour of the Presbytery and whole Church ὡς νόμον ἔχων. And *Ierom* and *Austin* on the 44. Psalme, call them the Princes of the Church, by whom she is governed. The assumption is proved particularly. Those who had directive power above others, and corrective, they had majority of rule. But B shops had. Ergo. The assumption proved. First, for directive power, the Presbyters were to doe nothing without them. *Ignat. ad Mag. ad Smyr.* They might not minister the sacrament of the supper but under the B shop, *Clem. Epist. 1. ad Jacob. Tert. lib. de bapt. Can. Apost. 38, Con. Carthag. 4. 38. Con. Car. 2. Can. 9. Con. Gan. 16. Conc. Ar. Can. 5.*

Secondly, that they had corrective power, it is proved, *Apoc. 2 & 3.* The Angel of *Ephesus* did not suffer false Apostles, and is commended for it, the Angel of *Thiatira* is reproved for suffering the like. Therefore they had power over other ministers. Cypr. lib. 3. Epist. 9. telleth *Rogatian* he had power to have censured his Deacon. *Ierom. adversus Vigilantium*, marvelleth that the Bishop where *Vigilantius* was, did not breake the unprofitable vessell. *Epiphanius* saith Bishops governed the Presbyters themselves, they the people. The Presbyters affixed to places and Churches, were subject to the Bishops, for when they were vacant, the bishop did supply them. Againe, the Presbyters had their power from him, and therefore were under him, and they were subject to the censure of the bishop. Those of his Clergie were under him; for he might promote them, they might not goe from one Dioceese to another without him, nor travell to the citie, but by his leave. The bishop was their judge, and might excommunicate them, Cypr. li. 1. Epist. 3. Concil. Carth. 4. cap. 59. Conc. Chal. cap. 9. conc. Nice. cap. 4. conc. Ant. cap. 4. ibid. cap. 6. cap. 12. Cart. 2. cap. 7. conc. Afric. cap. 29. conc. Ephes. cap. 5. conc. Chal. cap. 23. The examples of *Alexander* and *Chrysostome* prove this. All Presbyters were counted *acephali*, headlesse, that lived not in subjection to a bishop. The Pastors of parishes were either subject to bishops, or they had associates in Parishes joyned with them, or they ruled alone. But they had not associates, neither did they rule alone. Ergo, they were subject to the authority and jurisdiction of the bishop.

Answer.

The proposition of the first Syllogisme it must be thus framed. Those who had power of jurisdiction in themselves, without the concurrence of other Presbyters, as fellow judges, they were greater in majority of rule. Thus bishops had not jurisdiction. True it is, they were called governours and Princes of their Churches, because they were more eminent ministers, though they had

not

not Monarchiall power in Churches, but Conſull-like authority: and therefore when they affected this Monarchy, what ſaid *Ieroм*, *Noverint ſe ſacerdotes eſſe non dominos, noverint ſe non ad Principatum vocatos, ad ſervitium totius Eccleſiæ.* Sic Origen in Eſa. hom. 7.

To the proofe of the Aſſumption. Wee deny that they had this directive power over all Presbyters. Secondly, that they had it over any by humane conſtitution infallible. Presbyters were in great difference. Thoſe who are called *propriy ſacerdotes*, *Rectores*, *Seniores*, *Minorum Eccleſiarum præpoſiti*, the B ſhop had not, nor challenged not that directive power over them, which hee did over thoſe who were numbred amongſt his Clerickes, who were helpes to him in the Liturgy, in Chapells and pariſhes which did depend on him as their proper teacher, though they could not ſo ordinarily goe out to him. The firſt had power within their Churches, to teach, adminiſter, excommunicate, were counted brethren to the b ſhops, and called *Epiſcopi*, or *Coepiſcopi*, even of the Ancient: But the Presbyters which were part of their Clergy, they had this directive power over them, the Canons Eccleſiaſticall allowing the ſame. But I take theſe latter to have beene but a corruption of governing Presbyters, who came to bee made a humane miniſtery. 1. by having ſingular acts permitted. 2. by being conſecrate to this, and ſo doing *ex officio*, what they were imployed in by the biſhop. But ſure theſe are but helpes to liturgy, according to the Canons. Preaching did not agree to them further then it could bee delegated or permitted. Finally, wee read, that by law it was permitted them: that it was taken away from them againe by the biſhops: that it was ſtinted and limited ſometimes as to the opening of the Lords Praier, the Creed and ten Commandements: as it is plaine to him that is any thing converſant in the ancient. Secondly, let us account them as Miniſters of the word given by God to his Church: then I ſay, they could not have any direction, but ſuch as the Apoſtles had amongſt Evangeliſts: and this power is given to the biſhops onely by canon ſwerving from the firſt ordinance of Chriſt: for it maketh a Miniſter of the word become as a cypher, without power of his conſecration, as *Ierom* ſpeaketh, being ſo interpreted by *Filſon* himſelfe. Theſe decrees were as juſtifiable as that which forbiddeth any to baptiſe, who hath not gotten chriſme from the biſhop *Con. Carth. 4. cap. 36.* unleſſe the phraſes doe note onely a precedence of order in the b ſhop above Presbyters, requiring preſence and aſſent, as of a fellow and chiefe member, not otherwiſe.

To the proof of the ſecond part of the former aſſumption, 1. we deny this majority of corrective power to have beene in the Apoſtles themſelves: they had only a miniſtry executive inflicting that which

Christs corrective power imposed. Secondly, we deny that this ministeriall power of censuring was singularly exercised by any Apostle or Evangelist, where Churches were constituted. Neither is the writing to one above others, an argument that he had the power to doe all alone without concurrence of others. To that of *Cyprian* against *Rogatian*; we deny that *Cyprian* meaneth he would have done it alone, or that he and his Presbytery could have done it without the consent of Bishops neighbouring: but that he might in regular manner have beene bold to have done it, because he might be sure, *quod nos collega tui amnesid ratum haberemus*. *Cyprian* was of judgement, that he himselfe might doe nothing without the consent of his Presbyters, unlesse he should violate his duty, by running a course which stood not with the honour of his brethren. It was not modesty in him; but due observancy, such as he did owe unto his brethren. Neither did *Cyprian* ever ordinarily any thing alone. He received some, the people and the brethren contradicting, *lib.* 1. *epist.* 3. but not till he had perswaded them, and brought them to be willing. *Thou seest* (saith he) *what paines I have to perswade the brethren to patience.* So againe, *I hardly perswade the people, yea even wring it from them, that such should be received.* Neither did he take upon him to ordaine Presbyters alone: but propounded, made request for them, confessing, that further then God did extraordinarily prevent both him and them, they had the right of suffrage, no lesse then himselfe, as by these epistles may appeare, *lib.* 1. *epist.* 20. *lib.* 2. *epist.* 5. *lib.* 4. *epist.* 10. *Ierom* (though grandiloquent sometimes) did never thinke a Bishop could lawfully without his Presbyteries concurrence, excommunicate. If he were as *Moses*, yet he would have these as the seventy. Againe, *Ierom* doth write expresly of all in generall, *Et nos senatum habemus, coetum Presbyterorum, sine quorum consilio nihil agi à quoquam licet, sicut Romani habuerunt senatum cujus consilio cuncta gerebantur.* *Epiphanius* saith, Bishops governed Presbyters: but it doth not follow, that therefore they did it alone without concurrence of their com-Presbyters. As for the fixed Presbyters, the proofes are more unsufficient. The Bishop supplyed them, therefore they were under him. For Colleges supply Churches, yet have they no jurisdiction over them. Secondly, the canons did provide *ne plebi invito Presbyter obtruderetur*. Thirdly, we distinguish majority of rule from some jurisdiction. We grant the Bishop had such a jurisdiction as concerning the Church, so farre as it was in society with others, such as an Arch-bishop hath over a Province: but this did stand with the Rectors power of jurisdiction within his owne Church. Fourthly, though they had power by his ministeriall interposition, yet this doth not prove them dependant on him. For bishops have their power from others ordaining them, to whom notwithstanding they are not subject

ject in their Churches: In case of delinquency they were subject to the bishop with the Presbytery, yet so that they could not be proceeded against till consent of many other bishops did ratifie the sentence. Thus in *Cyprians* judgement; bishops themselves delinquent, turning wolves, as *Samosatenus, Liberius*, &c. are subject to their churches and Presbyteries, to be deposed and relinquished by them. As for those that were part of his clerks, it is true, they were in greater measure subject to him, absolutely in a manner for their direction: but for his corrective power he could not without consent of his Presbyters and fellow bishops, do any thing. The bishop indeed is onely named many times: but it is a common Synecdoche, familiar to the Fathers, who put the primary member of the church for the representative church, as *Austine* saith, *Petrum propter Apostolatus simplicitatem figuram Ecclesiæ gessisse.* See concil. Sardicen. cap. 17. conc. Carth. 4. cap. 2. 3. Tol. 4 cap. 4. Socr. lib. 1. 3. Soz. lib. 1. cap 14. As for such examples as *Alexanders*, it is strange that any will bring it, when he did it not without a Synod of many bishops, yea without his Clergie, as sitting in judgement with him. *Chrysostomes* fact is not to be justified: for it was altogether irregular, savouring of the impetuous nature to which he was inclined, though in regard of his end, and unworthinesse of his Presbyters, it may be excused, yet it is not to be imitated. As for those headlesse Clerkes, it maketh nothing for the Bishops majority of rule over all Churches and Presbyters in them. For first, it seemeth to be spoken of those that lived under the conduct of the Bishop, a collegiat life together, *Eode a refectorio & dormitori utebantur, & Canonicè viventes ab Episcopo instruebantur.* Now when all such Clerkes did live then as members of a Colledge under a master, it is no wonder if they be called headlesse, who did belong to no Bishop. Secondly, say it were alike of all Presbyters, which will never be proved (for all Presbyters in the Diocesse were not belonging to the Bishops Clerkes) say it were, yet will it not follow, that those who were under some, were subject to his authority of rule. For there is a head in regard of presidency of order, as well as of power. Bishops were to finde out by Canon the chiefe bishop of their Province, and to associate themselves with him. So bishops doe now live ranged under their Archbishops as heads. Priests therefore as well as Clerkes, did live under some jurisdiction of the bishops; but such as did permit them coercive power in their owne Churches, such as made the bishop a head in regard of dignity, and not of any power, whereby he might sway all at his pleasure. Thirdly, if the bishops degenerate to challenge Monarchy or tyranny, it is better to be without such heads then to have them: as we are more happy in being withdrawen from the headship of the bishop of Rome, then if he still were head over us.

To the laſt inſinuation proving that biſhops had the governement of thoſe Churches which Presbyters had, becauſe neither Presbyters alone had it, nor with aſſiſtents. I anſwer, they had as well the power of government, as of teaching: and though they had not ſuch aſſiſtants as are the presbyters of a cathedral church, yet they might have ſome, as a deacon, or other perſon ſufficient in ſuch ſmall Churches. When the Apoſtles planted a biſhop and Deacon onely, how did this biſhop excommunicate? When the fathers of Africa did give a biſhop unto thoſe now multiplied, who had enjoyed but a Presbyter, what aſſiſtants did they give him? what aſſiſtants had the *Chorepiſcopi*, who yet had government of their Churches?

The fifteenth Argument.

That which the orthodoxe churches ever condemned as hereſie, the contrary of that is truth. But in *Aerius* they have condemned the deniall of ſuperiority in one Miniſter above others. Ergo, the contrary is truth.

Anſwer.

To the propoſition, we deny that it muſt needs be preſently true, the contray whereof is generally condemned for hereſie. As the repreſentative catholicke Church may propound an error, ſo ſhe may condemne a particular truth, and yet remaine a catholicke church. To the aſſumption wee deny that the Church condemned in *Aerius* every denyall of ſuperiority, but that onely which *Aerius* runne into. Now his opinion I take to have been this. 1. He did with *Ierom* deny ſuperiority of any kinde as due by Chriſts ordinance: for this opinion was never counted hereſie, it was *Ierom's* plainely. 2. Hee did not deny the fact, that biſhops were ſuperiour in their actuall adminiſtration; he could not be ſo mad. If he had all that a biſhop had actually, how could he have affected to be a biſhop, as a further honour? Deniall of ſuperiority, ſuch as conſiſteth in a further power of order then a Presbyter hath, and in a kingly monarchicall majority of rule, this denyall is not here condemned: for all the fathers may be brought as witneſſes againſt this ſuperiority of the Church. What then was condemned in him? A deniall of all ſuperiority in one miniſter before another, though it were but of honor and dignity: and ſecondly, the denying of this in ſchiſmaticall manner, ſo as to forſake communion with the Church wherein it is. For in theſe words, ωωδὲν εἶναι διαφορώτερον ἐπίσκοπον τῦ πρεσβυτέρυ, it ſeemeth ωωδὲν ſhould bee read μὴ δὲν, that there ought to be none. Howſoever hee is to bee conceived as appoſing practically the difference of honour & dignity which was in the Church by Eccleſiaſticall inſtitution. What is this to us? Deniall of ſuperiority in regard of honor & dignity, joyned with ſchiſme, was condemned: Ergo, deniall of ſuperiority in power of order and kingly majority of rule, keeping the bond of love was condemned.

The

The aſſumption therefore if it aſſume not of this laſt deniall, then can it not conclude againſt us. Ergo, it is a truth that ſome Miniſters may be above otherſome, in order, honor, and dignity. But they underſtand not by order ſuch an order onely as is diſtinct, becauſe ſome degree of dignity is appropriate to it, which is not to other. Though this argument therefore touch us not, yet to ſpeake a little further about it, this opinion of *Aerius* is not to be handled too ſeverely: neither our authors, D. *Whitakerus*, D. *Reynolds*, *Danæus*, to be blamed, who doe in ſome ſort excuſe him. For biſhops were growne ſuch that many good perſons were offended at them, as the *Audiani*. Yea, it was ſo ordinary, that *Jerom* diſtinguiſheth ſchiſme from hereſie, becauſe the one conteined aſſertions againſt the faith, the other ſerved from the Church by reaſon of diſſenting from Biſhops. See him on Tit. 3. 10. Neither is it plain that he was an Arrian. *Epiphanius* reporteth it, but no other, though writing of this ſubject and ſtory of theſe times. Sure it is, *Euſtathius* was a ſtrong Arian, whom *Aerius* did oppoſe. Neither is it ſtrange to biſhops to faſten on thoſe which diſſent from them in this point of their freehold, any thing whereof there is but ungrounded ſuſpicion. Are not we traduced as Donatiſts, Anabaptiſts, Puritanes? As for this opinion, they thought it rather ſchiſmaticall, then hereticall: & therfore happily called it hereſie, becauſe it included error in their underſtanding, which with ſchiſmaticall pertinacy was made hereſie. Neither is it like that *Epiphanius* doth otherwiſe count it hereſie, nor *Auſtin* following him. For though *Auſtine* was aged, yet he was ſo humble, that hee ſaith, *Auguſtinus ſenex à puero nondum anniculo paratus ſum edoceri*. Neither was it prejudice to his worth for to follow men more ancient then himſelfe, who in likelihood ſhould know this matter alſo better. As for his calling it hereſie, it is certaine he would not have this in rigour ſtreined. For he doth proteſt (in his preface unto that booke of hereſie) that none to his thought, can in a regular definition comprehend what that is which maketh this or that to be hereſie. Though therefore he doubted not of this, that *Aerius* was in errour, ſuch as Catholickes ſhould decline: yet it doth not argue that hee thought this errour in rigour and former propriety, to have beene hereſie. Thus much for this laſt Argument.

On the contrary ſide I propound theſe Arguments following to be ſeriouſly conſidered.

Argument. 1.

Thoſe whom the Apoſtles placed as chiefe, in their firſt conſtituting of Churches, and left as their ſucceſſours in their laſt farewels which they gave to the Churches, they had none ſuperiour to them in the Churches. But they firſt placed Preſbyters, feeding

with the Word and governing: and to those in their last departings they commended the Churches. Ergo. The assumption is denied: they did not place them, as the chiefe ordinary Pastors in those churches, but placed them to teach and governe, *in foro interno*; with a reference of subordination to a more eminent Pastor, which when now they were growen to a just multitude should be given to them. The Apostles had all power of order and jurisdiction: they give to Presbyters power of order, power to teach, minister sacraments, and so gather together a great number of those who were yet to be converted; but kept the coercive power in their owne hands, meaning, when now by the Presbyters labour, the churches were growne to a greater multitude, meaning (I say) then to set over them some more eminent Pastors, Apostolicall men, to whom they would commit the power of government, that so they might rule over both the Presbyters and their Churches; and to these with their successours, not to the Presbyters, were the churches recommended. All which is an audacious fiction, without any warrant of Scripture, or shew of good reason. For it is confessed that Presbyters were placed at the first constitution, as the Pastors and teachers of the Churches. Now if the Apostles had done this with reference to a further and more eminent Pastor and Governour, they would have intimated somewhere this their intention: but this they doe not; yea, the contrary purpose is by them declared. For *Peter* so biddeth his Presbyters feed their flocks, as that he doth insinuate them subject to no other but Christ, the Arch shepheard of them all. Againe, the Apostles could not make the Presbyters Pastors without power of government. There may be governours without pastorall power; but not a Pastor without power of governing. For the power of the *Pedum*, or shepheards staffe, doth intrinsecally follow the Pastorall office. What likelihood is there, that those who were set as parents to beget children, should not be trusted with power of the rod wherewith children now begotten are to be nurtured and kept in awe beseeming them? If it be said, every one fit for the office of a Teacher, was not fit for a Governour: I answer, he that is fit to be a Pastor teaching and governing *in foro interno*, is much more fit to be a Governour externally: he who is fit for the greater, is fit for the lesser. It was a greater and more Apostolicall worke to labour conversion, and bring the churches a handfull in the planting (as some thinke) to become numbersome in people, then it is to governe them being converted. And it is absurd to thinke that those who were fit to gather a church, and bring it to fulnesse from small beginnings, should not be fit to governe it, but stand in need to have some one sent, who might rule them and the churches they had collected. Secondly, these Presbyters were (as themselves

ſelves confeſſe) qualified with the extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghoſt, and choſen by ſpeciall deſignation: ſo that to impute inſufficiency unto them, is harſh, and injurious to God, as well as to man. Finally, by the twenty of the Acts, and the firſt Epiſtle of *Peter*, cha. 5. it is plaine, they doe in their laſt farewels, commit the Churches unto the Presbyters, not ſuggeſting any thing of a further Paſtor to be ſent, who would ſupply their roomes; which yet they would not have forgotten, being a thing of ſo great conſolation, had it been intended by them.

Argument 2.

Thoſe who have the name and office of Biſhops common to them, they have no ſuperiour Paſtors over them: but the Presbyters Paſtor all have that name and office attributed to them. For firſt they are ſaid to governe in generall. Secondly, there is nothing found belonging to the power of the keyes *in foro externo*, but the Scripture doth aſcribe it to them, power of ſuffrage in councell. *Acts* 15. power of excommunication, which is manifeſt to have beene in the churches of Corinth when it had no biſhop; power of ordination, 1 *Tim.* 4. If any ſay, that this their power was but by commiſſion in them, and that they were ſubordinate to the Apoſtles in exercise of it, being to reteine it onely untill ſuch time as more eminent Paſtors ſhould be given: I anſwer, all this is ſpoken *gratis*, without any foundation, and therefore no more eaſily vouched then rejected. The Presbyters ſo had this power, that they did commit it to the biſhops, as we ſhall ſhew after: and therefore it muſt have beene in them, not by extraordinary commiſſion, but by ordinary office. Secondly, they were ſubject in exerciſe to none but Chriſt and the holy Ghoſt, who onely had out of authority truſted them with it. If the Apoſtles and they did concurre in doing one and the ſame thing, they did it as inferiour to the Apoſtles, and ſervants of a lower order, not with any ſubjection to them, as heads of derivation, ſerving Chriſt their onely Lord, no leſſe immediately then the Apoſtles themſelves.

Argument 3.

That which is found in all other orders of Miniſters inſtituted by Chriſt, may be preſumed likewiſe in the order of Paſtors and Doctors: but in all other orders, there were none that had ſingularity of preheminence and majority of power above other: No Apoſtle, Prophet, Evangeliſt had this rule one over another. If the propoſition be denied, upon ſuppoſall of a different reaſon, becauſe that though parity in a few extraordinary Miniſters might be admitted without diſorder, yet in a multitude of ordinary Miniſters, it could not but breed ſchiſme and confuſion, and therefore as the order of Prieſthood was divided into

a high

a high Priest, and other secondary ones, so is it fit that the Presbyters of the new Testament should be devided, some being in the first, and some in the second ranke. To this I answer, the parity is the more dangerous, by how much the places are supereminent. Secondly, though Pastors should be equall, yet this would not bring parity into the Ministers of the Church, some whereof should bee in degree inferiour to other, the governing Elders to the Pastors, and the Deacons to them. Thirdly, if every Church being an Ecclesiasticall body, should have governours every way equall, there were no feare of confusion, seeing Aristocracy, especially where God ordaineth it, is a forme of gouernment sufficient to preserve order. But every Church might then doe what ever it would within it selfe. Not so neither; for it is subject to the censure of other Churches synodically assembled, and to the civill Magistrate, who in case of delinquency, hath directive and corrective power over it. Parity doth not so much indanger the Church by schisme, as imparity doth by tyranny subject it. As for the distinction of Priests, wee grant it; but as man could not have made that distiction, had not God ordained it in time of the old Testament, no more can we under the new. Howbeit, that distinction of Priests did bring in no such difference in order and majority of rule, as our Bishops now challenge.

Argument 4.

If some be inferiour unto othersome in degree of power, it must be in regard of their power to teach, or their power to govern, or in the application of this power to their persons, or in regard of the people whom they teach and governe, or finally in regard the exercise of their power is at the direction of another. But no Pastor or Teacher dependeth on an other but Christ for any of these. Ergo. The proposition standeth on a sufficient enumeration: the assumption may be proved in the severall parts of it. The former branch is thus cleared. First, the power we have, is the same essentially with theirs; yea, every way the same. Secondly, wee have it as imediately from Christ as they. I shew them both thus: The power of order is the power which inableth us to preach and deliver the whole counsell of God, and to minister all Sacraments sealing Gods covenant. Now unlesse we will with the Papists, say that preaching is no necessary *annexum* to the Presbyters office, or that his power is a rudimentall limited power, as to open the creed, Lords praier, and commandements onely, or that he hath not the full power sacramentall, there being other sacraments of ordination and confirmation which wee may not minister, all which are grosse, wee must yeeld their power of order to be the same. Yea, were these sacraments properly, they are both grounded in the

power

power a Presbyter hath: Ordination in *doe this in remembrance of me*: confirmation in power to baptize. The power being the same, it is happily in one immediately, and in the other by derivation from him. Nothing lesse. All grant that Christ doth immediately give it, even as the inward grace of every Sacrament commeth principally from him. The Church, did she give this power, might make the sacrament and preaching which one doth in order, no sacrament, no preaching. The Pope doth not (if we follow the common tenent) challenge so much as to give the power of order to any bishop or priest whatsoever. If you say, the Presbyter is ordained by the bishop, that is nothing: so is the bishop by other bishops, from whom notwithstanding he receiveth not this power. We will take this as granted of all: though the truth is, all doe not maintaine it from right grounds. But it will be said the Presbyter is inferiour in jurisdiction, and can have none but what is derived to him from the bishop, who hath the fulnesse of it within his Diocesan Church. But this is false, and grounded on many false presumptions. As first, that Ministers of the Word are not properly and fully Pastors; for to make a Pastor, and give him no help against the Wolfe, is to furnish him forth imperfectly. Secondly, it presupposeth the power of jurisdiction to be given originally and fontally to one person of the Church, and so to others, whereas Christ hath committed it *originaliter* and *exercitative* to the representative Church, that they might Aristocratically administer it. Thirdly, this presupposeth the plenitude of regiment to be in the bishop, and from him to be derived to other: which maketh him a head of virtuall influence, that in his Church, which the Pope doth challenge in regard of all bishops. For his headship and spirituall soveraignty standeth according to *Bellarmine* in this, that the government of all *in foro externo*, is committed to him. Not to mention, how bishops, while they were bishops, gloried of their chaire and teaching, as the flower of their garland, preferring it farre before government, but when they were fallen from their spirituall felicity, and infected with secular smoke, then they recommended the labour of teaching to the Presbyters, then their jurisdiction and consistory did carry all the credite, every office in the Church being counted a dignity, as it had more or lesse jurisdiction annexed; as those are more or lesse honourable in the Common-wealth, which have civill authority in lesse or greater measure conjoyned. The truth is, it cannot be shewed that God ever made Pastor without this jurisdiction; for whether it do agree to men as they are Pastors, or as they are Prelats in the Church, it cannot be avoided but that the Pastor should have it, because though every *Præsul* or *Prælatus*, be not a Pastor, yet every Pastor is *Prælatus*, in order to that Church where he is the proper

and ordinary Paſtor. Yea, when cenſure is the moſt ſharp ſpirituall medicine, it were ill with every Church, if he who is refident alwayes among them as their ſpirituall Phiſition, ſhould not have power in adminiſtring it. Thirdly, I ſay, no Miniſter hath majority of power in applying the power of order or juriſdiction to this or that perſon. In the application there is a miniſtery of the Church interpoſed: but ſo that Chriſt onely is the cauſe with power, not onely why Presbyters are in the Church, but why *Thomas* or *John* is choſen to and beſtowed on this or that place. A Maſter onely doth out of power take every ſervant into his houſe: ſo God in his. God did chooſe *Aarons* ſonnes with the Levites, and Chriſt the 70. not mediately leaving it to the arbitrement of any to ſet out thoſe that ſhould ſtand before him. God doth ever onely in regard of authority, apply all power Eccleſiaſticall to every particular perſon, his ſole authority doth it, though ſometime as in ordinary callings, the miniſtery of others doth concurre. The Church is in ſetting out, or ordaining this or that man, as the Colledge is in chooſing, when ſhe taketh the man whom the ſtatute of her founder doth moſt manifeſtly deſcribe, or where the Kings mandate doth ſtrictly injoyne, it would otherwiſe bring an imperiall power into the Church. For though many Kings cannot hinder but that there ſhall be ſuch and ſuch officers, and places of government as are in their Kingdome, yet while they are free at their pleaſure to depute this or that man to the places vacant, they have a Kingly juriſdiction in them. Briefly, God doth ever apply the power Eccleſiaſticall unto the perſon: ſometime alone by himſelfe, as in the Apoſtles, and then he doth it *tam immediatione ſuppoſiti quam virtutis*: ſometime the miniſtery of man concurring extraordinarily, as when God extraordinarily directeth a perſon to goe and call one to this or that place, as he did *Samuel* to anoint *Saul*. Or elſe ordinarily, when God doth by his Writ and Spirit, guide men to take any to this or that place in his Church, which he doth partly by his written ſtatutes, and partly by his Spirit: and thus he doth make the application onely *immediatione virtutis*, not *ſuppoſiti*.

Obiect. But yet Biſhops have the Churches, and the care of them wholly committed to them; though therefore Miniſters have equall power to them, yet they cannot without their leave have any place within their Churches, and therefore are inferiour, in as much as the people with whom they exerciſe their power of order and juriſdiction, are aſſigned to them by the Biſhop the proper Paſtor of them. This is an error likewiſe: For God doth make no Miniſter to whom he doth not aſſigne a flocke which he may attend. God calleth Miniſters, not to a faculty of honour, which doth qualifie them with power to miniſterial actions, if any give them perſons among whom

they may exerciſe their power received, as the Emperours did make *Chartularios judices*, who had a power to judge cauſes if any would ſubject himſelfe to them. Or as the Count Palatine hath ordinary Judges, who are *habitu tantum judices*, having none under them, amongſt whom they may exerciſe juriſdiction. Or as the Univerſity giveth the degree of a Doctor in Phyſicke, without any patients among whom he may practiſe. But Gods Miniſtery is the calling of a man to an actuall adminiſtration, *Goe teach*: and the power of order is nothing by the way, but a relative reſpect, founded in this, that I am called to ſuch an actuall adminiſtration. Now there cannot be an act commanded, without the ſubject about which it is occupied: otherwiſe, God ſhould give them a faculty of feeding, and leave them depending on others for ſheep to feed; God ſhould make them but remote potentiall Miniſters, and the Biſhop actuall. Thirdly, the Holy Ghoſt is ſaid to have ſet the Presbyters over their flocke. A man taking a ſteward, or other ſervant into his houſe, doth give him a power of doing ſomething to his family; and never thinketh of taking ſervants, further then the neceſſity of his houſhold doth require: ſo is it with God in his Church, which is his houſe: fore the exegency of his people ſo require, he doth not call any to the function of Miniſtery. Againe, this is enough to ground the authority which Antichriſt aſſumeth: For ſome make his ſoveraignty to ſtand onely in this, not that he giveth order or power of juriſdiction, but that he giveth to all Paſtors and Biſhops the moity of ſheepe, on whom this their power is exerciſed, Chriſt having given him the care of all his ſheepe, *feed my ſheepe*: ſo *Vaſquez*. Thus if a Biſhop challenge all the ſheepe in a Dioceſan flocke to be his, and that he hath power to aſſigne the ſeverall flockes under him, he doth uſurpe an Antichriſtian authority. Finally, if the Churches be the Biſhops through the Dioceſſe, Miniſters then are under them in their Churches, but as a Curate is, whom a Parſon giveth leave to helpe within his Church. Yea, they ſhould looſe their right in their Churches, when the Biſhop dieth, as a Curate doth when the Parſon of this or that Church, whom he aſſiſted, is once departed. To conclude, they are not dependant (one Miniſter I meane on another) in the exerciſe and uſe of their calling. A ſervant that hath any place, doth know from his Maſter what belongeth to it. The Prieſts and Levites had ſet downe what belonged to their places, as well as the high Prieſt what belonged to his. Againe, God hath deſcribed the Presbyters office, as amply as any other. A Legate dependeth on none for inſtructions, but on him that ſendeth him; now every Miniſter is an Embaſſadour of Chriſt. By their reaſon a Miniſter ſhould be accountant to man for what he did in his Miniſtery, if his exerciſing of it did depend on man. Then alſo

ſhould miniſters mediately onely ſerve God, in as much as they have done this or that, to which the biſhop did direct them. Moreover, ſhould the biſhop bid him not preach at al, preach rarely, teach onely ſuch and ſuch things, or come and live from his charge, he ſhould not ſinne in obeying him. But man cannot limit that power of miniſtery which he cannot give. It is not with Gods ſervants in his Church, as with civill ſervants in the Common-wealth: for here ſome ſervants are above others whom they command as they will ſuch as are called *ſervi ordinarii* or *præpoſiti*, ſome are under others to do this or that commanded by them, commonly called *ſervi vicarii*: but in the Church all ſervants ſerve their Maſter Chriſt, neither having any that they can command, nor being under any but Chriſt ſo as to be commanded by them. But it may be objected, that God hath ordained ſome to be helpes and aſſiſtants to otherſome. It is ſaid that God hath ordained powers, helps, governours, 1 Cor. 12. 8. and were not the Evangeliſts aſſiſtants to the Apoſtles, doing that to which they directed them? To this I anſwer, that the helps God hath put in his Church reſpect the calling of Deacons, and ſuch as miniſtred to the infirme ones: As for Evangeliſts, they were companions and aſſiſtants to the Apoſtles, but it was in order to the work of God in their hands, which they were to ſerve, not in order to their perſons, as if they had been ſubjected to them in any ſervile inferiority. Obſerve how *Paul* ſpeaketh of them, 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. *Titus* was his companion and helper towards them, *Phil.* 2. 25. *Epaphroditus* was his brother and helper in his worke, and fellow ſouldier, 1 *Theſſ.* 3. 2. *Timothy* was his coadjutor in the Goſpell of Chriſt, 2 *Tim.* 4. 11. *Marke* was helpefull in the Miniſtery. The truth is, this was *ſervitus non perſonalis ſed realis*, the Evangeliſts did ſerve the worke the Apoſtles had in hand, without being ſervants to their perſons. When bricklayers worke, ſome mixe lime, and make mortar, ſome beare up tile and mortar, ſome ſit on the houſe and there lay that which is brought them. Theſe are all fellow ſervants, yet the one doth ſerve to ſet forward the worke of the other. But were they not left to the direction of the Apoſtles, wholly in exerciſe of their calling? I anſwer, as Chriſt gave ſome to be Evangeliſts, ſo he made them know from himſelfe what belonged to their office, and what was the adminiſtration to which he called them. He did not therefore wholly leave them to the direction of any. There is a double direction, one *poteſtativa*, which is made from majority of rule *ex diverſitate*, the other *ſocialis*, ſuch as one ſervant, having fit knowledge of his maſters will, and ripe experience, may give to another. The latter kinde of direction it was, not the former, by which the Evangeliſts were directed. Which though commonly *Paul* uſed, yet not ſo univerſally but that they went ſometime of their owne accords

hither

hither and thither, as may be gathered, 2 *Cor.* 8. 16, 17. and 2. 7. 14, 15.

The fift Argument.

That which the Apoſtles had not over Prophets, Evangeliſts, Presbyters, nor Deacons themſelves that power which the Church hath not over any member, the biſhop hath not over other miniſters. But they had not over any inferior officers any majority of directive or corrective power: neither hath the Church it ſelfe any ſuch power. Ergo. The aſſumption is provyd: for majority of directive and corrective power is a Lord-like and Regall power: now there is no ſuch power in the Church, or in the Apoſtles, or in any but onely in that one Lord: all other power being but a declarative and executive miniſtery to ſignifie and execute what Chriſt out of majority of power would have ſignified and put in execution.

The ſixth Argument.

That which doth breed an Antichriſtian uſurpation, never was of Chriſts inſtitution. But biſhops majority of power in regard of order and juriſdiction, doth ſo: Ergo. That which maketh the biſhop a head as doth *influere* derive the power of externall government to other his aſſiſtants that doth breed an Antichriſtian uſurpation. But to claime the whole power of juriſdiction through a Dioceſan Church, doth ſo: for he muſt needs ſubſtitute helpers to him, becauſe it is more then by himſelfe he can performe. But this is it which maketh Antichriſt, he doth take upon him to be head of the whole Church, from whom is derived this power of externall government: and the biſhop doth no leſſe in his Dioceſan Church, that which he uſurpeth differing in degree onely and extenſion, not in kind from that which the Pope arrogateth. If it be ſaid that his power is Antichriſtian, becauſe it is univerſall: it is not ſo. For were the power lawfull, the univerſality could not make it Antichriſtian. The Apoſtles had an univerſality of authority, yet no Antichriſts, becauſe it did not make them heads, deriving to others from their fulneſſe: it was not prince-like majority of power, but ſteward-like and miniſteriall onely. If one doe uſurpe a kingly power in Kent onely, he were an Anti king to our Soveraigne, no leſſe for kind, then if he proclaimed himſelfe King of England, Scotland, and Ireland. There is but one Lord, and many miniſtrations. Neither doth this make the Popes power papall, becauſe it is not under a Synod: for the beſt of the Papiſts hold, and it is the moſt common tenent, that he is ſubject to an Oecumenicall Councell. Secondly, though he be ſubject, yet that doth not hinder but he may uſurpe a kingly government: for a King may have a kingly power, and yet confeſſe himſelfe accountable to all his people collectively conſidered:

red: neither doth this make the Bishops lawfull in one Church, because one may manage it, and the Popes unlawfull, because none is sufficient to sway such a power through the whole Church: for then all the power the Pope doth challenge, is not *per se*, but *per accidens*, unlawfull, by reason of mans unsufficiency, who cannot weild so great a matter.

The seventh Argument.

Those Ministers who are made by one patent in the same words, have equall authority: but all Ministers of the Word are made by the same patent, in the same words, *Receive the holy Ghost, whose sins ye forgive, &c.* Ergo. The proposition is denied: because the sense of the words is to be understood according as the persons give leave to whom they are spoken. These words spoken to Apostles, they gave them larger power then to a Bishop: and so spoken to a Presbyter they give him lesse power then to a Bishop. *Answ.* If the Scripture had distinguished of Presbyters Pastoral feeding with the Word, and made them divers degrees, as it hath made Apostles and Evangelists, then we would grant the exception: but the Scripture doth not know this division of Pastors and Doctors into chiefe and assistent: but speaketh of them as of Apostles and Evangelists, who were among themselves equall in degree. Wherefore as no Apostle received by these words greater power then another: so no Pastor or Teacher, but must receive the same power, as who are among themselves of the same degree. Secondly, were they different degrees, yet it should give the Presbyter for kind, though not of so ample extent as the Bishop hath, as it giveth the Bishop the same power for kinde, which the Apostles had, though not so universall, but contracted to particular Churches.

Now to come unto some conclusions or assertions which may lead light unto the deciding of this question.

Concluſ. 1. Let this be the first. No Minister of the Word hath any power but ministeriall in the Church. Power is naturall or morall. Morall is Civill or Ecclesiasticall. Civill is either Lord-like and ruling, or ministeriall and servile. So Ecclesiasticall, taken largely for all power subjectively in, or objectively about the Church, is either Lord-like and Regall, such as is in Christ, or it is ministeriall and servile, such as is in the Church and the principall members of it. The power therefore of the Apostles themselves and Evangelists, is called διακονία, Act. 20. 1 Tim. 4 yea such a service, as doth make the ministers having it, so servants, that they are no way Lords. *Many ministers, one Lord: we preach Christ, our selves your servants for Iesus sake.* S. *Paul* maketh his power steward-like, not regall. Now as that is regall power which doth any thing from the authority one hath in himselfe, or from ones pleasure: so that is ministeriall power

which

which doth nothing but tying the will and power of him that is principall: a power which signifieth or executeth this or that *ex mero alterius obsequio*.

*Conclus.*2. This ministeriall power is no supernaturall vertue or quality inherent in the soule: but a relative respect founded on this, that I am called by God to this or that actuall administration in his Church. For it is not a power simply, whereby a man is made able to doe some supernatural act, which he could not before in any manner performe: but it is respectively said a power, in as much as it doth inable him to doe those acts in the Church of God lawfully, and *ex officio*, with which before he might not intermeddle. The power of a Deacon, Pastor, Evangelist, Apostle, belong to one predicament in regard of that which is the genus or common nature of them: the power of the Church cannot be other. Naturall and civill power doth with vertue and efficacy reach those effects and ends to which they are designed: because they are proportioned to them, and exceed not their activity: but Ecclesiasticall power cannot thus concur to the end and effects for which it is ordained: because they are such as the omnipotenty of God onely can produce, as the converting or creating grace in the heart of a sinner, to which no supernaturall vertue in man can by any reall, though instrumentary efficacy, conduce any thing.

Conclus. 3. God hath not given ministeriall power to any, which himselfe is not personally to discharge, nor in further plenitude then that by himselfe it may be performed. The reason is, because God cannot give one the charge of doing more then a mans proper industry can atchieve, but he must withall put it in a mans power to take others, and to impart with them power of teaching and governing, so farre as may supply that defect which is in his strength to performe it alone. He that will have the end, will have that without which the end cannot be attained. If God would have any one an universall pastor to all the Churches of the world, he must needs allow him power to substitute Pastors here and there, deriving unto them power both to teach and governe, so far as may supply his absence in the Pastorall cure. If I will have one keepe my flockes which goe in twenty sheepe-gates, if I commit them to one, I must needs together give him leave to assume unto himselfe such as may be under shepheards to him. Thus if God give a Bishop the plenitude of Pastorall care and government over all the Parishionall Churches through a Dioceſſe, he must needs together allow him this power, of being a head of internall influence, even a head virtually communicating with others part of pastorall power, whether teaching or government. Thus should none but Bishops be *ex officio* servants in Pastorall cure to God: all others should be

imme-

immediately and formally ſervants to the biſhop, and doe every thing in the name of the biſhop, being immediately onely and in a remote ſenſe the ſervants of God: as in the former compariſon of one ſervant receiving from his maſter the care of all the flockes, he is the maſters ſervant to whom the maſter committeth the truſt, from whom he onely looketh to ſee it performed: but thoſe whom this ſhepheard taketh to himſelfe for his aid, they come under his dominion, and are ſervants to him. If it be ſaid, that God doth not thus make the biſhop Paſtor, but that he will likewiſe that there be pariſh Paſtors under him, and helps of government. To this I anſwer, If God will have them, then either after his owne deſignement, or elſe leaving it to the biſhops arbitrement: if he leave it to the biſhops arbitrement, then the objection before is in force, God will looke for the cure from him onely, he ſhal take according to his judgment, ſuch as may helpe him. If God will have them after his owne deſignment, then he giveth the biſhop no more Paſtorall power then he can diſcharge himſelfe, others having their right in all the biſhop cannot execute, as well as the biſhop, and as immediatly from Chriſt. Some write, as if the Apoſtles had the plenitude of all Paſtorall power, that from them it might be derived to the Church, it being ſeene through nature, that inferiour things receive influence from the ſuperiour. But they miſconceive the matter; they had onely a power to ſerve the Church with the perſonall ſervice of their Apoſtleſhip. The Paſtorall power of Evangeliſts, or of ordinary Paſtours and teachers, they never had. For as Chriſt gave the one order, ſo the two other alſo, for the gathering of the Saints, and exædifying of the body of Chriſt: and no perſon in any ranke had any power to do this or that in the Church further then himſelfe might performe in perſon. The ſteward in a houſe hath full power of a ſteward, but not the power of all other officers, as Clark of the kitchin, Butler, Chamberlaine, &c. So in theſe divers orders of ſervants in Gods houſe, his Church. If the Apoſtles had had the fulneſſe of Paſtorall cure, they ſhould then have ordained others Evangeliſts, and Paſtors not onely by miniſteriall mediation of their perſons calling them, but alſo by mediation of vertue.

Concluſ. 4. One miniſteriall power may be in degree of dignity above another. For the power of one may be about more noble acts then the power of another, or in the ſame kinde, the power of one may be more extended, and the power of another more contracted. Thus the Deacons had for the object of their power and care, not ſo excellent a thing as that of Paſtors, Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles. Thus the power of ordinary Paſtors was not ſo univerſall as the Apoſtles, even as in the orders of ſervants domeſticall, ſome are implied about leſſer, ſome about greater and more honorable ſubjects.

Cond.

Concl. 5. No order of Ministers or servants can have majority of directive and corrective power over those who are in inferior order of Ministery and service. The reason is, because this exceedeth the bounds of ministeriall power, and is a participation of that despoticall power which is appropriate to the master of the family.

Concl. 6. Servants in one degree may have power to signifie their masters direction, and to execute ministerially what their master out of his corrective power inflicteth on their fellow servants in other degrees. Thus Pastors signifie Gods will to governing Presbyters and Deacons, what he would have them to doe in their places. Thus the Apostles might informe all orders under them.

Concl. 7. This power ministeriall tending to execute the pleasure of Christs corrective power, was committed to some in extraordinary degrees, personally and singularly, and might be so in some cases exercised by them. I meane singularity without concurrence of any others. This without doubt was in the Apostles and Evangelists: and it was needfull it should be so: first, because it might be behovefull there to excommunicate whereas yet Churches were not risen to their perfect frame: secondly, because there might be some persons not setled as fixed dwellers in any Church, whom yet to be cast forth was very behovefull. Againe, some Evangelists might incurre censure, as *Demas*, in such sort as no ordinary Churches power could reach to them.

Concl. 8. That ordinarily this power is not given to any one singularly by himselfe to exercise the same, but with the company of others constituting a representative Church: which is the point next to bee shewed. Yea where Churches were constituted, the Apostles did not offer to exercise their power, without the ministeriall concurrence of the Churches, as in the story of the Corinthians is manifest.

THE THIRD QVESTION

Whether Christ did immediatly commit ordinary power Ecclesiasticall, and the exercise of it, to any singular person, or to united multitude of Presbyters.

THough this question is so coincident with the former, that the grounds hath in a sort been discussed, yet for some new considerations which may be super-added, we will briefly handle it in the Method premised.

First, it is argued for the affirmative.

Argum. 1. That which is committed to the Church, is committed to the principal member of the Church. But exercise of jurisdiction was committed to the Church, Mat. 18. 17. Ergo. Either to the whole Church, or to a Church in the Church, or to some one eminent member in the Church. But it was not committed to be exercised by the whole Church, or to any Church in the Church. Ergo, to one who is in effect as the church, having all the authority of it. Secondly, if one person may be representatively a Church, when jurisdiction is promised; then one person may be representatively a Church when jurisdiction and power of exercising is committed. But one singular person, *Peter* signified the Church, when the promise of jurisdiction is made. Ergo. *Cyprian* to *Jubaia* saith, that the bishop is in the Church, and the Church so in the bishop, that they cannot be severed. Finally, as the kingdome of England may be put for the King in whom is all the power of the Kingdome: So the Church for the chiefe governour in whom is the power of it.

The second Argument.

That which the Churches had not given them when they were constituted, that was not promised to them as their immediat right. But they had not coercive power given them when they were constituted. Ergo, Christ did not commit it to the Churches or Presbyters

byters. For then the Apoſtles would not have withheld it from theſe. But they did. For the Apoſtles kept it with themſelves. As in the inceſtuous Corinthian is manifeſt, whom *Paul* by his judgement was faine to excommunicate. And the Theſſalonians are bid to note the inordinate, and ſignifie them, as not having power within themſelves to cenſure them. And ſo *Paul* alone excommunicated *Hymenaus* and *Alexander*.

The third Argument.

That which *Paul* committed to ſome prime men in Churches, and their ſucceſſours, that was not committed to Presbyteries, but ſingular perſons. But in power of ordination and juriſdiction, he did ſo. For to *Timothy* in Epheſus, and to *Titus* in Crete, he commended the power and exerciſe of it. Ergo.

The fourth Argument.

That order which was moſt fit for exerciſing power of juriſdiction, that Chriſt did ordaine. But the order of one chiefe governour is fitter for execution, then the order of a united multitude. Ergo.

The fifth Argument.

If all authority and power of exerciſe be in the Church originally, then the Paſtors derive their power from the Church. But this is not true. Ergo, it was not committed to the Church. That authority which the Church never had, ſhee cannot convey. But the Paſtorall authority of word and Sacraments never was in the Church eſſentially taken. Ergo, it cannot be derived from her. Againe Paſtours ſhould diſcharge their office in the name of the Church, did they receive their power from the Church.

The ſixth Argument.

If the power of juriſdiction and execution be committed from Chriſt to the Church, then hath the Church ſupreame power. Then may a particular Church depoſe her biſhop, the ſheepe cenſure the ſhepheard, children their fathers, which is abſurd.

On the other ſide it is argued,

Argum. 1. That which Chriſt doth preſuppoſe as being in many, and to be exerciſed by many, that never was committed by Chriſt to one, and the execution of any one. But Mat. 18. Chriſt doth manifeſtly ſuppoſe the power of juriſdiction to be in many, and that *exercitative*, ſo as by them being many, it is to be exerciſed. Ergo. Now this is plaine in the place. Where firſt marke, that Chriſt doth preſuppoſe the authority of every particular Church taken diſtinctly. For it is ſuch a Church as any brother offended may preſently complaine to. Therefore no univerſall, or provinciall, or Dioceſan Church gathered in a Councell. Secondly, it is not any particular Church that doth ſend all Chriſtians to, for then all Chriſtians in the world ſhould come to one particular Church, were

it possible. He doth therefore presuppose indistinctly the very particular Church where the brother offending and offended are members. And if they be not both of one church, the plaintife must make his denunciation to the Church where the defendant is, *quia forum sequitur reum.* Thirdly, as Christ doth speake it of any ordinary particular Church indistinctly, so he doth by the name of Church not understand essentially all the congregation. For then Christ should give not some, but all the members of the Church to be governors of it. Fourthly, Christ speaketh it of such a Church to whom woe may ordinarily and orderly complaine: now this we cannot to the whole multitude. Fiftly, this Church he speaketh of, he doth presuppose it as the ordinary executioner of all discipline and censure. But the multitude have not this execution ordinary, as all but *Morelius*, and such Democritall spirits doe affirme. And the reason ratifying the sentence of the Church, doth shew that often the number of it is but small: *For where two or three are gathered together in my name.* Whereas the Church or congregations essentially taken for teachers and people, are incomparably great. Neither doth Christ meane by Church the chiefe Pastor, who is virtually as the whole Church. For first, the word Church doth ever signifie a company, and never is found to note out one person. Secondly, the Bishop may be the person offending or offended, and the Church to which he must bring the matter, must be other then himselfe. Thirdly, the gradation doth shew it. First, by thy selfe, *Then shew a witnes or two. Then to the Church*, as the sinne increaseth, the number of those by whom it is to be rebuked and censured, increaseth also. If one say, though the Church signifie one governour, yet the gradation holdeth, for to tell it to the governour in open Court, is more then to tell it to twenty. Wee grant that this is true, and were the word Church taken here to note some eminent governour, it might be brought in as a further degree, though one onely were enforced. But how can *Peter* be complainant, if *Peter* the Præsul onely be the judge to whom the thing must be denounced. Fourthly, the church in the Corinthians which *Paul* stirreth up to censure the incestuous person, was not any one but many. Their rebuke upon which it is like he repented, was a rebuke of many, 2 Cor. 2.6. Fifely, if the church had been one, he would not have subjoyned: *for what ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven.* Sixtly, if the church did not note an assembly, how could he assure them from hence, *that God would do what they agreed on, because he was with the least assemblies gathered in his name.* Unlesse the Church meant were an assembly, this argument could not be so correspondent. Where two or two or three are assembled in Gods name, God is in the midst of them to doe that they agree on. But where the Church is binding or loosing, there

are

are some assembled in the name of Christ. Ergo. Lastly, the church in the old Testament never noteth the high Priest virtually, but an assembly of Priests sitting together, as Judges in the causes of God. Wherefore as Christ doth indistinctly presuppose every particular Church: So he doth here onely presuppose the joint authority, and joint execution of a representative Church, a Presbytery of Elders who were Pastors and Governours.

Argum. 4. Wee argue from the practice of the Churches. That power which is not in one, nor to bee exercised by one, but in many, and to be exercised by many in the Church of the Corinthians, that power with the exercise of it, was committed by Christ to many, not to one. But the power of Ecclesiasticall censure was in many, and to be performed by many assembled. Ergo. The proposition is plaine. For *Paul* would not have called for, nor have liked any constitution or exercise of power Ecclesiasticall, other then Christ had ordained. The assertion is denyed by some: but it is a plaine truth by many invincible arguments. For first, *Paul* doth rebuke them that they had not set themselves to cast them forth. Now (as *Ambrose* saith on the place. *Si autem quis potestatem non habet, quem scit reum abjicere, aut probare non valet, immunis est.* Secondly, *Paul* doth wish them assembled together, with himselfe in the name and vertue of Christ, that they might deliver him up to Sathan. For hee doth not call on them to restraine him as already excommunicated, but to purge him out as an infectuous leaven yet amongst them. Thirdly, *Paul* doth tell them that they had power to judge those within, those who were called brethren, and lived otherwise. Fourthly, *Paul* doth tell them that they did a rebuke or mulct of many, writing to them that they would not proceed, 2 Cor. 2 6. Lastly, *Paul* doth attribute power to them to forgive him, and to receive him to the peace of the church. Which would not have been in them, had they not had the power to excommunicate. Such as have no power to binde, have no power to loose. So it might be proved by the Church of the Thessalonians, 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. *If any man walk inordinately, note him, that others may refraine him* Noting, being not a signification by letter, which doth wrest the word against all copies, and the current of all Greek interpreters: but judicially to note him, that all may avoid him; that is, excommunicate him. Finally, the churches of Asia, as it is plaine, had power of government within themselves.

Argum. 5. That power which the Apostles did not exercise in the churches, nor Evangelists, but with concurrence of the churches and Presbyteries, that power is much lesse to be exercised by any ordinary Pastour, but by many. But they did not ordaine, nor lay on hands alone, they did not determine questions by the power of the keyes alone, but with concurrence of the Presbyters of the church. Ergo, much lesse may any ordinary

Minister doe it alone. *Timothy* received grace by the χειροθεσία of the Presbytery. For that Persons must be understood here is apparant by the like place; when it is said, by the laying on of my hands, μὴ noteth a person, and so here a Presbytery. Secondly, to take πρεσβυτέριον to signifie the order of Priesthood, is against all Lexicons, and the nature of the Greeke termination. Thirdly, *Timothy* never received that order of a Presbyter, as before we have proved. Fourthly, it cannot signifie as Greeke Expositers take it, a company of bishops. For neither was that Canon of 3. bishops and the Metropolitan, or all the bishops in a Province, in the Apostles time, neither were these who are now called bishops, then called Presbyters, as they say, but Apostles, men that had received Apostolick grace, Angels, &c. Finally, it is very absurd to think of companies of other Presbyters in Churches then *Paul* planted; but he placed Presbyteries of such Presbyters as are now distinguished from bishops, which is the grant of our adversaries. Not to mention how *Armachanus* doth censure the other as an interpretation from ones privat sence, besides testimonie of Scripture.

Thus the Apostles did not offer alone to determine the question Act. 15. but had the joynt suffrages of the Presbytery with them. Not because they could not alone have infallibly answered, but because it was a thing to be determined by many; all who had received power of the keyes, doing it *ex officio*, and others from discretion and duty of confession the truth. Yea the bishops called *Primi Presbyteri*, had no ordination at the first which the Prebytery did not give them. Whence have bishops of other Churches power to minister the sacrament to the bishop of this Church? But *Timothy* and *Titus* are said to have ordained Ministers. As Consuls and Dictators are said to have created Consuls, because they called Senates, propounded and together with others did it. No otherwise doe Jesuits themselves understand it. *Salmeron* on the first of *Titus*, &c. And it is manifest by Ecclesiasticall writings of all sorts, that Presbyters had right of suffrage, not onely in their owne Presbyteries, but in Provinciall Synods, and therefore in Oecumenicall Synods, which doth arise from a combination of the other, to which their mindes went in the instruction of bishops received from their Churches. And *Athanasius* yet a Deacon, is read to have beene at the Counsell of Nice, and to have had right of suffrage in it. Finally, the Presbyteries did a long time execute jointly all actions of Church government, as is before declared. Other arguments we shall touch in answer of these which have beene objected. Now to come to the conclusions, let this be first.

Concluſ. 1. Extraordinary power was committed to some singu-

lar

lar persons, so that in some case they might singularly exercise it without concurrence of other. This I speake in regard of Apostles and Evangelists, whose power in many things could not have concurrance of particular Churches, which in the former question is sufficiently declared.

Conclus. 2. That ordinary power, and the execution therof was not committed to any singular governors, whereof there was to be one onely in each Church. This is against the Jesuits, who make account (the most of them) that as all civill power of government is given to Kings to bee executed by them within their commonwealth, so Ecclesiasticall power (say they) is given to the Pope and to bishops in their particular Churches to be executed by them, and derived from them to the whole Church.

Conclus. 3. Ordinary power with the execution thereof, was not given to the community of the church, or to the whole multitude of the faithfull, so that they were the immediate and first receptacle, receiving it from Christ, and virtually deriving it to others. This I set downe against the Divines of Constance; our prime Divines, as *Luther* and *Melanchton*, and the Sorbonists, who doe maintaine it at this day. Yea, this seemeth to have beene *Tertullians* errour; for in his booke: *de pudicitia*, he maketh Christ to have left all Christians with like power, but the church for her honor, did dispose it as we see. The proposition of a politick body, and naturall deceived them, while they will apply all that is in these to Christs mysticall body, not remembring that *analogon* is not *in omnisimile*, for then should it bee the same with the *analogatum*. True it is, all civill power is in the body politicke, the collections of subjects, then in a King from them! And all the power of hearing, seeing, they are in the whole man, which doth produce them effectually, though formally and instrumentally they are in the eare and eye. But the reason of this is, because these powers are naturall, and what ever is naturall, doth first agree to the community or *totum*, and afterward to a particular person and part, but all that is in this body, cannnot hold in Christs mysticall body. In a politick body power is first in the community, in the King from them, but all Ecclesiasticall power is first in our King before any in the church from him. But to whom should he first commit this power, but to his Queene. *Answ.* Considering this power is not any Lordly power, but a power of doing service to the church for Christ his sake. Therefore it is fit it should be committed to some persons, and not to the whole community which are the Queene of Christ. For it is not fit a King should commit power to his Queene to serve herselfe properly: but to have persons who in regard of his relation should stand distinguished from her. Secondly, in naturall bodies, the power of seeing is first

immediatly

immediately in the man, from the man in the eye and particular members: In the mysticall body, the faith of a beleever is not first immediatly in all, then in the beleever, but first of all and immediatly in the personall beleever, for whose good it serveth more properly then for the whole, every man being to live by his owne faith. The power of Priesthood was not first in the Church of Israel, so derived to the Priest: but immediatly from Christ seated in *Aaron* and his sonnes. *Object.* Yea they were given the church *intuitu ejusdem tanquam finis & totius. Answ.* I but this is not enough, that power may be said to be immediatly received by the church as the first receptacle of it, and from it derived to others, as the power of seeing is not onely given *intuitu hominis* as the end of it, and the *totum* to whom it agreeth, but is *in homine* as the first subject from whom it commeth to the eye. But the power even of ordinary Ministers is not in the church. For as all are said not to have beene Apostles, so not to have beene Doctors. But if the power of ordinary teaching had been given to every beleever, all should have beene made Doctors, though not to continue so in exercising the power. Secondly, were the power in the church, the church should not onely call them, but make them out of vertue and power received into her selfe: then should the church have a true Lordlike power in regard of her Ministers. Besides, there are many in the community of Christians uncapable of this power regularly, as women and children. This conclusion in my judgement *Victoria, Soto* & others deny with greater strength of reason then the contrary is maintained.

Conclus. 4. Fourthly, ordinary power of ministeriall government is committed with the execution of it, to the Senat or Presbytery of the church. If any faile in any office, the church hath not power of supplying that, but a ministery of calling one whom Christ hath described, that from Christ he may have power of office given him in the place vacant.

Conclus. 5. Lastly, though the community have not power given her, yet such estate by Christ her husband is put on her, that all power is to bee executed in such manner, as standeth with respect to her excellency. Hence it is, that the governours are in many things of greater moment to take the consent of the people with them. Not that they have joynt power of the keyes with them, but because they sustaine the person of the spouse of Christ, and therefore cannot bee otherwise dealt with, without open dishonour in such things, which belong in common to the whole congregation.

Now to answer the arguments first propounded.

The Proposition of the first Syllogisme is denyed. *That what was committed to the Church was committed to some principall member.* And we deny the second part of the next Syllogisme, proving this part

denyed,

denyed. *Nor the power and execution was committed to a Church in a Church.* Which is ſo farre from abſurdity, that he is abſurd who doth not ſee it in Civill and Sacred. Doe we not ſee in Parliament a repreſentative Common-wealth within our Common-wealth, having the greateſt authority? Not to mention that a Church within a Church ſhould not be ſtrange to them who imagine many Pariſhionall churches within one Dioceſan church. To the proofes which prevent as it were an objection, ſhewing that the church, *Mat.* 18. 17. may be put for one chiefe Governour.

The propoſition is denyed. *If that Peter one Governour, may be in type and figure the Church to whom the juriſdiction is promiſed, then the Church receiving and executing it may be one.* A moſt falſe Propoſition whoſe contrary is true. The reaſon is, becauſe the church typified by *Peter* is properly and really a church, not figuratively and improperly: for then *Peter* ſhould have beene a figure or type, of a type or figurative church. The figure therefore and type being of the church which is properly taken, and the church properly and really taken, being a company aſſembled, hence it is that (*Matth.* 18. 17.) the church cannot ſignifie one; for one is but figuratively and improperly a church. There is not the ſame reaſon of the figure and the thing that is figured. Nay hence an Argument may be retorted, proving that by that church whereof *Peter* was a figure, is not meant one chiefe Governour. *Peter* as one man or Governour was properly and really a virtuall church and chiefe Governour. But *Peter* as one man and Governour was in figure onely the church. *Matth.* 18. Ergo, that church *Matth.* 18. is not a virtuall church, noting forth one chiefe Governour onely. As for *Cyprians* ſpeech, it doth nothing but ſhew the conjunction of Paſtour and people by mutuall love, which is ſo ſtreight that the one cannot be ſchiſmatically left out, but the other is forſaken alſo. Otherwiſe I thinke it cannot be ſhewed to the time of *Innocent* the third, that the Biſhop was counted the church; or this dreame of a virtuall church once imagined. The Clerkes of the church of *Placentia* did in their oath of canonicall obedience ſweare thus: *That they would obey the Church of Placentia, and the Lord their Biſhop.* Where the Chapiter doth carry the name of the church from the Biſhop. Yea, even in thoſe times prepoſed, or ſet before him, when the Pope was lifted up above generall councels, then it is like was the firſt nativity of theſe virtuall churches. As for a Kingdome I doubt not, but it may be put for a King figuratively: but the church typified by *Peter*, muſt needs be a church properly. And it will never be proved that any one Governour was ſet up in a church proportionable to a King in a Common-wealth, in whom is all civill power whereby the whole Kingdome is adminiſtred.

To the ſecond Argument from the Apoſtles fact in the Church of Corinth, who judicially (abſent) ſentenced his excommunication, *I have decreed or judged*, leaving nothing to the Church, but out of their obedience to decline him, as in the 2. Epiſt. 2. he ſaith, *For this cauſe I have written to you, that I may proove whether you will in all things bee obedient.* What Arguments are theſe? He that judgeth one to be excommunicated, hee leaveth no place for the Preſbyters and Church of Corinth judicially to excommunicate. Thus I might reaſon, *Act.* 15. 17. from *Iames*, ἐγω κρίνω He who doth judicially ſentence a thing hee leaveth no place to other Apoſtles and Presbyters to give ſentence. The truth is, the Apoſtle might have judged him to be excommunicate; and an Evangeliſt, if preſent, might have judged him alſo to be excommunicate, and yet place left for the Churches judgement alſo. Theſe are ſubordinate one to the other. Here it may be objected, that if place be left for the Churches judgement after the Apoſtles ſentence; then the Church is free not to excommunicate where the Apoſtles have, and the ſame man ſhould bee excommunicate and not excommunicate. *Anſ.* Suppoſe the Apoſtles could excommunicate *Clave errante*, Without cauſe, it is true. But the Apoſtles ſentence being juſt, ſhee is not free, in as much as ſhee cannot lawfully but doe that which lyeth on her; when now it is eſpecially ſhewed her, and by example ſhee is provoked. Yea, where ſhe ſhould ſee juſt cauſe of excommunicating ſhe is not (though none call on her) free not to excommunicate. Nevertheleſſe, though ſhe is not free, ſo as ſhe can lawfully not excommunicate, yet ſhe is free, ſpeaking of freedome abſolutely and ſimply, and if ſhe ſhould not excommunicate him, hee ſhould remaine not excommunicable but excommunicate, by theſe judgement, yet it ſhould not be executed, by the ſiniſter favour of a particular Church. As, ſay *Saul's* ſentence had beene juſt, and the peoples favour had beene unjuſt, *Ionathan* had beene under condemnation, but execution had beene prevented by the peoples headſtrong affection towards him. *Ob.* So they who obeyed *Paul* they did not judicially excommunicate. *Anſ.* As though one may not exerciſe power of government by manner of obedience to the exhortation of a ſuperior. Touching the place in the *Theſſalonians*, thoſe that read, *Note him by an Epiſtle*, doe goe againſt the conſent of all Greeke Interpreters. And the context doth ſhew, that it is a judiciary noting one, ſuch as cauſed him to bee avoided by others, and tended to breed ſhame in him. As for *Pauls* excommunicating *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, It will not follow. That which he did alone an ordinary Paſtor may doe alone. Secondly, it is not like he did it alone: but as he caſt out the Corinthian, though the whole proceeding be not noted. Though *Paul* ſaith, *I delivered them*

them. So he ſaith, grace was given *Timothy* by impoſition of his hands, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. when yet the Presbytery joyned, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14 Thirdly, it may be they were no fixed members in any conſtituted Church.

The third argument of *Timothy* and *Titus* hath beene ſufficiently diſcuſſed.

To the fourth, *That one is fitter for execution then many.* To which we may adde, that though the Biſhops be but as Conſuls in a Senat, or Vice-chancellors in a Univerſity, having when they ſit with others, no more power then the reſt. Yet thoſe have execution of many things committed to them. The aſſertion. viz. *That many are leſſe fit for execution,* we deny. That order is fitteſt which God inſtituted. But he doth commit the keyes to the Church, to many, that they might exerciſe the authority of them; when that mean is moſt fit, which God will moſt bleſſe, and his bleſſing doth follow his owne order, this is the fitteſt. Secondly, in the Apoſtles times, and in the times after, almoſt foure hundred yeeres expired, Presbyters did continue with Biſhops in governing and executing what ever was decreed. Thirdly, this deprivation from the firſt order, one to execute for a Dioceſan, one for a Provinciall, the decrees of a Dioceſan and Provinciall, drew on a neceſſity of one to execute the decrees of the Oecumenicall Church or Pope. Fourthly, Let them ſhew where God divided the power of making lawes for government of any Church from the power to execute them. Regularly they who have the greater committed, have the leſſer alſo. Fifdly, we ſee even in civill governments many parts by joynt Councell and action are as happily governed as others are by a ſingular governour. Truely, that the Affrican Fathers write to *Celeſtine* is true: *It is unlikely that God will be preſent with one, inſpiring him with his ſpirit, and not be preſent with many who are in his name, and with his warrant aſſembled.* As for thoſe compariſons they hold not in all: they hold in that which the Conſull doth in calling the aſſembly, propounding things, &c. Yet the Conſuls never took the power to cenſure their fellowes without the concurrence of their fellow Senators, nor to withdraw themſelves from being ſubject to the cenſure of the reſt of the Senate.

To the fift argument, to the propoſition by diſtinction: if they have all power both of miniſteriall application, and inſtituting others out of vertue and authority, then Paſtours derive. But this is denyed. She hath no power but of Miniſtery. and no plenitude but ſo farre as they in their owne perſons can diſcharge. It preſuppoſeth therefore we affirme in our queſtion what we doe not. But to let the propoſition paſſe, becauſe of ſome derivation, it is true. If ſhe have but all power of Miniſteriall application, then Biſhops

derive from her. But they doe not. We say they doe. And whereas it is objected, that which the Church never had she cannot convey it. I answer, that which the Church never had, she cannot virtually convey it. but she may as ministering to him who hath the power and vertue of deriving it. Nothing can give that which it hath not, either formally or virtually, unlesse it give it as an instrument to one who hath it. A man not having a penny of his owne, may give an hundred pounds if the King make him his Almoner. A Steward may give all offices in his masters house, as ministerially executing his masters pleasure. Thus the Church deriveth, as taking the person whom Christ describeth, and out of power will have placed in this or that office in his Church. This answereth to the last suggestion. For if the Church did virtually, and out of power make an officer, it is true, as we see with those whom the King maketh in the common-wealth. But if she doe it in Steward-like manner, ministring to the sole Lord and master of his house, then is not he so taken in to doe in his name, but in his masters name. As a Butler taken in by a servant, doth execute his office not in master Stewards name, but in his masters, who onely out of power did confer it on him.

The last objection I answer. That the particular Church may depose their Bishop. What member soever in the Church is the offending person, may be complained of to the Church. The Church of Philippi, if it had power to see that *Archippus* doe his dutie, then it had power to reprove and censure him not doing it. If the Church have power by election to choose one their Bishop, and so power of instituting him, then of destituting also. *Instituere & destituere ejusdem est potestates.* But he is given the onely judge in Christs roome, and though they elect him, yet as you have said, and truely, they have not the power of that authority in them to which he is elected. No more then the Electors of the Emperour have in them power of the Imperiall dignity. *Answer.* We say therefore, that as the Church hath onely ministeriall power of application, that is, as they cannot out of power call a Pastour, but onely call one whom Christ pointeth out, and to whom Christ out of power giveth the place of Pastour. So she cannot censure or depose, but onely ministerially executing the censure of Christ, who will have such a one turned out, or otherwise censured. But the Bishop never was sole judge, though κατ' ἐξοχὴν he may be said so. Christ instituted a Presbytery, in which all had equall power of judgement. *Cyprian Ep. 68.* in the case of *Basilides* and *Martialis*, doth shew that the Church had power as of chooſing worthy, so of refusing unworthy. He speaketh of an ordinary power, as by chooſing is manifest, not extraordinary and in case of necessities. And Mr. *Field* maintaineth, that

that *Liberius* was lawfully depoſed by the Church of Rome. Surely I marvell men of learning will deny it, when no reaſon evinceth the Pope though a generall Paſtor ſubject to the cenſure of a Church Oecumenicall, but the ſame proveth a Dioceſan Biſhop ſubject to the cenſure of the particular Church. Unleſſe they will ſay with ſome Schoolmen, *Soto*, viz. That the Pope is but the vicar of Chriſt in the generall Church: but the Biſhop is both the vicar of Chriſt, and alſo repreſenteth the generall Church in his Dioceſſe, whence he cannot be proceeded againſt by the Church that is a particular. As if to be a vicar of Chriſt were a leſſer matter then to repreſent the generall Church, with whom in his calling the Church Oecumenicall hath nothing to doe.

To that which is objected touching Fathers, Paſtors; the ſimilitudes hold not in all things. Naturall parents are no wayes children, nor in ſtate of ſubjection to their children: but ſpirituall fathers are ſo fathers, that in ſome reſpect they are children to the whole Church. So ſhepherds are no way ſheepe, but miniſters are in regard of the whole Church. Secondly, Parents and Shepherds are abſolutely parents and ſhepherds, be they good or evill: but ſpirituall Parents and Paſtors are no longer ſo then they doe accordingly behave themſelves. Beſides, are not civill Kings Parents and Paſtors of their people? yet if they be not abſolute Monarches, it was never eſteemed as abſurd, to ſay that their people had power in ſome caſes to depoſe them. If their owne Churches have no power over them, it will be hard to ſhew wherein others have ſuch power of juriſdiction over perſons who belong not to their owne churches. But Lord Biſhops muſt take ſtate on them, and not ſubject themſelves unto any triall, but by their Peeres onely, which is by a Councell of Biſhops.

FINIS.

Library of the
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
New York